

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE

Unearthing the Mysteries of the Frank Palmer Archaeology
Collections

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of Master of Arts in Anthropology, Public Archaeology

By

Monica Corpuz

May 2015

The Thesis of Monica Corpuz is approved

Dr. Michael Love

Date

Dr. Rachel F. Giraudo

Date

Dr. James Snead, Chair

Date

California State University, Northridge

Acknowledgements

Without the assistance of many people, this thesis never could have been completed. First and foremost, I would like to thank my advisor, James Snead, for his unending patience and guidance throughout the process. Without his work as a resource, and his enthusiasm for the subject, this thesis would not have gotten off the ground. I would also like to thank Professors Michael Love, Rachel Giraudo and Matthew Des Lauries for their edits, consultation and sage guidance. Thanks to Dennis Harbach who has supplied me with endless Lummi stories and newspaper clippings. The Autry National Center of the American West, and its employees Karimah Richardson, Ann Stoddard, Liza Posas and Marva Felchlin for their assistance, research and constant support throughout the process. They are a group of fantastic ladies that allowed me to bounce ideas off of them, talk endlessly about Frank Palmer and encouraged my research whenever possible. Also my amazing family, who have encouraged me, allowed me to complain and cry to them, and attempted to understand what I was saying throughout my tenure as a graduate student. No, Frank Palmer is not the man who made the iced-tea and lemonade drink. Special thanks to Thomas Garcia, my very patient fiancé, and to Helen Layfield, the coolest grandmother that ever lived. Lastly, thanks also to my archaeology family, Robert David, Melissa Lori, Makai Magie, Allison Hill, Brittany Bankston, and others, who have been right there in the trenches with me- sometimes literally- over the past years.

Table of Contents

Signature Page.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Abstract.....	vii
Chapter: 1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Introduction to Historical Context.....	2
1.2 Research Goals.....	5
1.3 Methodology.....	7
1.4 Structure of Thesis.....	9
Chapter 2: Museums and the Social Life of Artifacts.....	11
2.1 Museums and Artifacts as Commodities.....	11
2.2 The Social Life of Artifacts.....	16
2.3 The Smithsonian and the Bureau of American Ethnology.....	18
2.4 Influential Individuals.....	23
2.5 Early Archaeologists in California.....	28
Chapter 3: Frank Palmer.....	32
3.1 Introduction to Frank Palmer and Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.....	32
3.2 Introduction to the Southwest Society.....	34
3.3 Museum Expeditions and the Growth of the Southwest Society.....	37
3.4 Charles Fletcher Lummis.....	40
3.5 The Friendship of Palmer and Lummis.....	41
3.6 The Frank Palmer Archaeology Collections.....	42
3.7 Publicity and Public Acclaim for the Palmer Collections.....	46
Chapter 4: The Feud.....	47
4.1 The Feud.....	47
4.2 Curatorial Responsibilities.....	48
4.3 Professional Publications and Forced Oversight.....	49
4.4 Fieldwork and Gossip.....	52
4.5 Mismanagement and the “King” of the Southwest Society.....	56
4.6 Public Controversy.....	57
4.7 Arbitration.....	62
4.8 The War is Lost.....	65
Chapter 5: The Collection.....	68
5.1 The Palmer Southern California Archaeology Collection.....	68
5.2 Summary of the Cataloguing Process from May to August 2014.....	68
5.3 Redondo Beach.....	76
5.4 Trade and Possible Ways the Artifact Information Was Lost.....	78
5.5 Discussion.....	80
Chapter 6: Conclusion.....	81
6.1 Politics and Collecting Practices.....	81
6.2 Commodities and Control.....	82
6.3 The Next Phase of an Old Collection’s Social Life.....	84
Abbreviations for Archives.....	88

References Cited.....	89
Appendix A: 2014 Artifact Catalogue.....	108

List of Tables

Table 1: Palmer Collections Timeline.....	45
Table 2: Collection Location and Context.....	69
Table 3: Objects Catalogued as Fragmented or Damaged.....	72
Table 4: Artifact Types.....	75

Abstract

Unearthing the Mysteries of the Frank Palmer Archaeology Collections

By

Monica Corpuz

Master of Arts in Anthropology, Public Archaeology

Competition is a central component of professional engagement. Disagreements among colleagues and the tragedy of an amateur's failure to gain influence within the blossoming anthropological discipline, provides a critical case study in the professionalization of the field as a whole. The Frank Palmer archaeology collections were the founding collections of the first museum in Los Angeles, the Southwest Museum, of the Southwest Society, that was formed in 1903. The Frank Palmer collections represent an important resource for research into early collecting practices and the aims of early museum archaeologists within the United States. Palmer's eventual conflict with Charles Lummis, a man with more cultural capital, led to his collection to become fragmented and himself to be expelled from the profession. This research on the Frank Palmer controversy, and both his collections and historical documents surrounding these events, can provide a better understanding of early collecting practices and how human disputes have influenced the development and professionalization of archaeology within the United States.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Museums and archaeology have often been intertwined disciplines that developed along similar trajectories during in the United States. Professional standards along with education create professionalism within the disciplines and serve to eliminate or limit amateur involvement. Understanding how these intertwined branches of work and learning created these professional standards along with educational opportunities for the fields is important for understanding the purposes and existence for these disciplines as a whole. The turn of the 19th century was a particularly significant era for this transformation, a time when professionalism was beginning to create a boundary to separate the amateurs and enthusiasts from the professionals. Scholarship on this topic to date has focused on institutions in the eastern United States: in contrast, very little research has been done on the role of individuals and institutions from the west coast of the United States, particularly from Los Angeles.

Museums, as institutions and cultural centers, are integral to modern life and are an important locus of controversies surrounding professionalism. There is a social status that an individual can attain by aligning themselves with a museum- a kind of perceived authority and knowledge about history, archaeology and culture. However, does working in a museum automatically make a person a knowledgeable expert on archaeological, anthropological and museums studies?

Additionally, how did individuals help to shape professionalism for archaeologists and museums? What were their original purposes and how has that changed? More importantly, when did standards for museums and archaeologists, particularly those that contribute artifacts to museums, come about and why?

This project analyzes an in-depth case study of the circumstances around one amateur archaeologist/museum curator, Frank Palmer, who helped to establish the first museum in Los Angeles, the Southwest Museum, a process in which his collections played a pivotal role. Their changing value and status along with their “social lives” (Kopytoff 1986) will be examined from Palmer’s era through today, allowing for a greater understanding of the engagement between people, collections, and institutions.

The story of the circumstances around Frank Palmer, disagreements among colleagues and the tragedy of an amateur’s failure to acquire influence within the blossoming anthropological discipline, is an example of professionalization of the fields at the turn of the 19th century in the United States from the west coast. This thesis focuses on the history of collecting and the rise of professional archaeology within the United States, with an emphasis on individual’s roles in the development of both these fields.

1.1 Introduction to Historical Context

The events highlighted in this thesis occurred from the late 1800s through the early 1900s in Los Angeles, California. However, the origins and repercussions of the events far exceed this limited time frame. In-depth case studies, such as this one, represent a resource for understanding and tracking the development of anthropology, museums and archaeology within the United States as its own distinct style of research and analysis. Individuals in particular make up the vast proportion of influences for the trajectory of the development of these institutions and fields of study.

In the United States during the late 1800s the interest in collecting Native American remains and artifacts was increasing (Trigger 1996:160). The previous era of curiosity cabinets of well-to-do citizens and their investigations into mounds, graves and

abandoned cities in the desert, created a romantic and mysterious past for the still young country (Patterson 1995:54-55). Institutions were created in the east, such as the Smithsonian Institution (1846), the American Museum of Natural History in New York (founded 1869), and the Peabody Museum at Harvard (1866). These new institutions helped to define and develop a national heritage for the United States and became beacons of education and enlightenment. They also provided opportunities to rewrite the United State's national history, since "the mythical 'New World' erased the shackles of European history, creating a blank slate from which a new society could emerge" (Little 2007:14; See also Trigger 1996:117).

The Chicago Columbian Exposition of 1893 was one of the major events in the United States that spurred public interest in Native American history and influenced the trajectory of museum work (Hinsley 1981:112). The Cliff Dweller Exhibit shown at the fair inspired a romantic view of the American West. The exhibit consisted of "panoramic paintings of Two Story House and other sites [which] formed a backdrop for the exhibition of over 2,000 artifacts" (Butler and Shackley 2002:47). Photos of the West taken during, were exhibited at the Exposition but also in popular magazines and newspapers, such as Harpers New Monthly Magazine. The sweeping deserts, large mountains in the distance and the beauty of abandoned prehistoric ruins shown in these photos furthered the romantic notion of the American West as a wild and empty territory ripe with hidden treasures within its sands. Butler and Shackley wrote, "[a]n unfortunate side effect of the published photographs of ancestral pueblo ruins was the creation of entrepreneurial "pothunter" rush to these sites" (Butler and Shackley 2002:6). The damage done by pothunters/relic hunters at archaeological sites of the Southwest was

extensive in terms of today's archaeological practices (Moratto 2004; Benson 1997:21). They did not take notes and hap-hazardously dug into ruins and graves, since the goal was to procure artifacts and not research on the sites themselves (Benson 1997:18). Thus "archaeology as a cultural enterprise in the years between 1850 and 1900 is revealed as an exercise in recovery of the human legacy, whether gold treasure or pottery sherds" (Hinsley 1989:94).

During the time between 1850 and 1900 there were few archaeologists that were employed outside of the government. Other than Frederic Ward Putnam at Harvard, there was little formal training or institutional support (Snead 2001:7; Benson 1997:12). The relic hunters were not the only competition to scholarly endeavors since professionals also vied for sites and artifacts from each other. However, even professional archaeologists, backed by the Smithsonian at this time, failed to meet the basic standards that characterize the discipline today.

By the 1980s, however, separation between pothunters and professionals was evident. "The growing rift between scholarly and public audiences for Southwestern archaeology would result in resentment and resistance," James Snead has written, "and in efforts to construct new modes of archaeology that would accommodate different perspectives" (2001:21). There was a dramatic change from 1890 to 1900s for the archaeological and anthropological disciplines. Professional standards along with education began to be developed for museums and anthropologists while scientific organizations and publications flourished (Butler and Shackley 2002:35; Kehoe 1999:5; Hinsley 1981:263). Additionally, by 1901 archaeology had finally developed into a recognized discipline within the United States (Butler and Shackley 2002:35; Kehoe

1999:5; Jacknis 2002:529). As Kehoe notes, by this time, “[p]ractitioners equipped with academic degrees had preempted the field, imposing upon it a model of “objective” science emphasizing the collection of concrete specimens and direct observations” (Kehoe 1999:5). Moreover, competing institutions and individuals in the United States, for both artifacts and control, brought about increased professional standards for anthropology, and helped to define clear borders between disciplines. Professionalism eventually limited amateur involvement and evolved into “increasing interdependence and the resulting crisis of authority” (Snead 2003:Introduction).

It is during this time of contentious attitudes between the pothunters and the professionals that Frank Palmer enters into the narrative as an enthusiast who attempted to become a professional. Through identifying and analyzing the circumstances around Frank Palmer during the establishment of the Southwest Museum in Los Angeles, along with his eventual falling out with his friend turned rival, Charles Lummis, a clearer picture of the push for professionalism in Los Angeles can be seen. In addition, the effect of the events on the Frank Palmer archaeology collections from southern California will be explored to view how human interactions affect such legacy collections.

1.2 Research Goals

The Frank Palmer archaeology collections were the first collections owned by the Southwest Society, who founded and created the Southwest Museum in Los Angeles. The importance of these archaeological collections for Frank Palmer, the founders of the Southwest Society and Southwest Museum, as well as for the residents of Los Angeles at large, is well documented in newspaper articles, meeting minutes and publications. These collections were used to pursue the larger agenda of the residents in the Southwest

portions of the United States, asserting that the west coast had important scientific collections that could rival institutions to those in the east. The artifacts were also used by Palmer himself as leverage to move from the amateur sphere to the professional one by becoming a museum curator. However, to date, little research has been conducted on these collections or on the collector himself. Additionally, not all of the artifacts themselves are accounted for, were documented when acquired, nor were ever fully catalogued.

Modern professionalism comes with education and the establishment of professional standards. Perhaps Los Angeles has not been as researched for the origins of professionalism for American archaeology because, “[e]ducational opportunities in western states were fewer than in the east” (Mills 2005:61). However, as this case study demonstrates, professionalism was also occurring in Los Angeles at the time.

It is therefore important to understand the motives and aims of the individuals who were instrumental in establishing the Southwest Museum in Los Angeles and how they developed and contributed to the archaeological discipline and to forming professional standards. This research also seeks to understand why the Palmer collections did not ever achieve the lasting national prestige that the founders of the Southwest Society and Museum thought they would. Instrumental to this, it is necessary to uncover Palmer’s collecting techniques as well as attempting to discover the provenience and provenance of the remaining artifacts in order to understand why they were collected from those locations, and what was considered important enough to preserve. Collections such as the Frank Palmer archaeology collections are an important resource for research

into collecting practices and professionalization of early archaeologists and institutions in the United States.

The hypothesis is that the Frank Palmer archaeology collections, and the man himself, did not continue to enjoy the favorable publications and public acclaims because of internal politics within the Southwest Society. These internal politics most notably include the feud between Frank Palmer and Charles Lummis, which focused on Palmer's abilities as a professional archaeologist and museum curator. Additionally, because Palmer's feud with Charles Lummis was played out on a national stage with many prominent individuals weighing in, the issue of professional standards and what constitutes appropriate archaeological and museum work came to light. These internal politics, and the feud, were caused by individual rationales and conflicting views on professional archaeology and museum practices.

Additionally, these initial collecting and preservation practices helped to determine what kinds of artifacts were considered important in archaeological research, for educational and display purposes, and for what was considered valuable enough to be continue to be preserved. These objects have a social life in which they are valued differently in different social contexts, and could be used as a commodity in which to promote an individual or even an institution into appearing more professional (Appadurai 1986). Therefore, the social context that these objects were collected in, displayed in and preserved in, directly affects their value. It is the contention of this thesis that these internal politics produced a negative value to be attributed to these objects.

1.3 Methodology

The majority of the research for this thesis was conducted during the summer of 2014, in between the months of May and August, in the Braun Research Library and in the archaeological collections at the Autry National Center of the American West on the Southwest Museum campus. Additional research was conducted up until May of 2015 in a variety of capacities, including additional museum and archival research.

Archival research emphasized correspondence, reports, newspapers, and publications in order to achieve a holistic view of the issues around Frank Palmer during this time period. The Braun Research Library's institutional archives contain the meeting minutes and personal letters of Palmer and other individuals directly involved in the acquisition and preservation of the Palmer archaeology collections.

Research was also conducted on the remaining Frank Palmer collection artifacts themselves. The examination of the artifacts was done primarily to determine where they came from, from what context, the objects that remain, and to determine the intactness of the remaining artifacts. The artifacts were identified and catalogued in an Excel spreadsheet, Appendix A, by location.

By using this evidence to reconstruct the history of the Frank Palmer archaeology collections- from the time that they were collected to their first few initial displays- their social life as objects and their changing value, in different contexts, over time can be better understood. By context, it is meant the social and cultural forces around these practices within a certain time period. This can lead to an increased understanding of how and why particular artifacts were collected in the first place, and which ones managed to continue to stay valuable, or not, later in time. Additionally, it is important to regard these artifacts as not only having social lives, but also as being commodities (Kopytoff 1986).

Their value as a commodity is directly affected by the demand in the society for them and their use as leverage for individuals and institutions to establish themselves as authorities within the field. The demand of artifacts is influenced by the social context within a time period and must be understood in this framework. Therefore, the circumstances surrounding Frank Palmer could directly impact the demand and value of his archaeology artifact collections.

1.4 Structure of Thesis

Chapter 2 will provide a deeper context of the institutions and individuals involved in anthropology from 1850 to the early 1900s in order to provide context for Palmer's actions. It will also outline museums as research institutions and their changing roles in the United States from the establishment of the Smithsonian to present day. The social lives of artifacts will also be explored since artifacts can be valuable to individuals and institutions as resources to advance professional prestige. The chapter also introduces other notable early archaeologists and their work in the United States. The goal of this is to provide context for Palmer's actions in light of what other professional archaeologists were doing at the time.

Chapter 3 introduces Frank Palmer, his archaeology collections and his involvement with several societies and institutions. The chapter expands on the Southwest Society, a historical organization which Palmer helped to form, and other key individuals involved. Palmer's life as an amateur archaeological collector trying to turn into a professional is also explored. This chapter introduces Charles Lummis as a key figure in the Frank Palmer case study. Lastly, it takes a look at the newspaper articles and

Palmer's and Lummis' roles in promoting and exploiting the collections for personal goals.

Chapter 4 details the very public feud between Palmer and Lummis. The origins and motivations for the argument are explored as well as how it unfolded on a national stage, prompting important and influential individuals to weigh in. The ultimate outcome of the feud is discussed as well, along with some repercussions- some of which served to highlight the dichotomy between professionals and amateurs.

Chapter 5 discusses the Frank Palmer archaeology collection itself, now at the Southwest Museum. The origins of the collection and the collecting practices involved in the initial procurement of the artifacts are analyzed. Important sites that may have been the source of many of the artifacts are discussed, along with possible reasons for the dispersal of some of this collection over the past one hundred years.

Chapter 6 is the conclusion, which discusses internal politics of institutions and their repercussions on the success or failure of an individual's ambitions and goals. This is because, as Hinsley pointed out, "(p)ersonal desire and expectation complicated formal institutional relationships" (Hinsley 1981:76). Artifacts as commodities are further explored within this political context and how that can affect the social lives of the artifacts themselves. These often forgotten collections represent a valuable resource for exploration into the history of museums, anthropology and archaeology, as well as opportunities for analysis on the objects themselves.

Chapter 2: Museums and the Social Life of Artifacts

Museums and archaeological collecting practices are fundamentally intertwined from their early stages in the western portions of the United States. Establishing a context for this relationship is thus necessary in order to understand the Palmer collection and its role in debates regarding professionalism in American archaeology.

2.1 Museums and Artifacts as Commodities

Susan Pierce claims that Western collecting practices took shape in the 15th and 16th centuries. These initial practices and mentalities created the modern collecting techniques and rationales that came after (Pierce 1995:123; Bazin 1967:20). Pearce asserts that a long history has characterized how and why people collect objects in the United States (1995:57-83). She particularly emphasizes the role that material objects have as a way of connecting with oneself and with history, and how this can be seen repeatedly throughout European history. Additionally, she argued, “how European attitudes to the accumulation of goods have helped the system to continue developing along its characteristic trajectory, both in terms of social relationships and in terms of the kind of individuals involved in it” (Pearce 1995:30). Therefore, certain individuals combined with personal rationales for collecting, characterize the majority of collectors.

The rise of museums in the western tradition is in itself complex (Bazin 1967:18-20). The establishment of museums in Europe created a forum for enthusiastic collectors to display their assemblages (Yasaitis 2006:450). The artifacts that were displayed intrigued the public with not only the ‘otherness’ and exoticness of many of the objects, but also with the history of the peoples who produced them. Pearce says that these “[o]bjects were already seen to be ‘true relics’ by reason of their ‘real relationship’ with past people and

events were transformed by the romantic eye into a sensation of knowing the past, of resurrecting the body of the past intact so that it might be experienced in the present” (Pearce 1999:131). Museums allow for interaction between people and objects, which in turn, inspire the imagination and allow for the feeling that one is personally bonded to the past.

The British Museum provides a relevant case study for understanding the rise of museums as institutions since it is one of the earliest examples of a public western museum that was officially established. This is because according to Yasaitos (2006:452), “[t]he creation of the British Museum, transforming the princely gallery into an accessible “people’s museum,” predated the establishment of the Louvre as a public museum”. Its founder, Sir Hans Sloane (1660-1753) was a trained doctor who also studied a variety of scientific subjects, such as botany and anatomy (Yasaitos 2006:451). He traveled to the Caribbean where he acquired hundreds of plant and animal specimens to bring back to Britain. By the time of his death he had acquired about 71,000 objects of which he left for the British government for a modest 20,000 pounds (Yasaitos 2006:452). The British government purchased a mansion in which to house and display these objects. The British Museum’s gallery spaces reflected Sloane’s research and collecting aims, that of exotic plants and animals mainly. Therefore, the ultimate realization of the museum, at least initially was the result of the Sir Han Sloan’s collecting ambitions and the popular attitudes of the day.

The purpose of many museums, both historically and recently, is to educate the public through a display of objects (Yasaitis 2006:450). This initial aim of showcasing exoticism has changed over the past hundred years to that of education through

observation (Yasaitis 2006:450). Moreover, Akinori asserts that there is an “explicit education” that curators are pushing (Akinori 2010:796; Findlen 1989:35). Meaning that the designing of the exhibits are pushing a certain agenda; either their own or the institution’s. Exhibits are agenda-laden and contain specific messages that are imparted upon the gazing public (Findlen 1989:34-35). This also implies that what is collected, by individuals and by museums, is also agenda-laden and often for a specific purpose itself.

Museums were initially private and were slowly transformed to public institutions (Findlen 1989:24; Bazin 1967:20). These changes over time for museums, from private to public and from entertainment to education, are a part of a larger transformation for museums and anthropology as a whole- that of increased educational opportunities and creation of professional standards.

Before proceeding, definitions must be provided. Pearce provides a definition of a collection: “Collections are essentially composed of objects which bear an intrinsic relationship with each other in a sequential or representative sense, rather than each being valued for its own qualities” (Pearce 1995:20). Therefore, an object taken out of its collection, in this case its context, loses its inherent value. This loss of value is ironic since objects culled for collections are taken out of their original context only to be placed in a new one. Consequently, the meaning and utility of an artifact changes once it is taken out of its original context and placed into a collection. Each object comprises a piece that contributes to the meaning-laden whole. The individual, or collector, that accumulates these separate objects, is choosing characteristics based on their own rationale and personally perceived symbolism.

By removing these objects from their original context, the collector is literally setting them apart from their original milieu. For archaeological artifacts, this literally means removing the objects from their use, purpose and symbolism from one culture, to inscribe new ones in another. The objects are taken and, because of their 'chosen' status, become sacred or set-apart from the objects that are deemed less worthy. Consequently, the collector is the one determining what is sacred and profane in the archaeological record, and thus, their resulting collection is a reflection of their own values.

Additionally, Yasaitis (2006:450) claims "[w]hat is collected is what is deemed desirable, and what seems desirable is telling of the views and beliefs of a society at its time". Therefore, collections themselves can be a relic; telling of the interests and issues at the time of its origins.

The collecting practices of the late 1800s in the United States were formed by the Western capitalist pursuits that originated centuries earlier (Pearce 1995:123). Indeed, Appadurai (1986:49) asserts "[i]t should now be clear that capitalism represents not simply a techno-economic design, but a complex cultural system with a very special history in the modern West". Western culture and the economic and social practices of capitalism are therefore inexorably tied together.

It is useful to view artifacts and archaeology collections as commodities, in which their value depends on the demand for them. If there was no interest or demand for archaeological artifacts, then we would not dig them up, seek them out, or display them. Marx defined commodities as, "in the first place, an object outside us, a thing that by its properties satisfies human wants of some sort or another" (Marx 1978 [1867]:303). Even though this initial definition is broad, it is useful to conceptualize that commodities are

physical objects and that the demand for them is based on wants or needs. Marx's views on commodities were specific to his belief that capitalist societies fashioned the demand for goods in which the lower classes actively produced them, while the upper class consumed most of them. Viewing archaeological artifacts in this light, it becomes apparent that these objects were collected within a capitalist framework, and that the amassing of them was a remnant of the Western colonial origins of the United States, at least in part. Furthermore Hinsley (1981:83-84) claims museums, "contributed to the celebration of America's coming of industrial age by demonstrating relative racial and national accomplishment".

The demand and consumption of artifacts then is socially and culturally motivated. Human curiosity, newly formed scientific pursuits, and studies into social issues at the time, like the BAE conducted on the Native Americans, are some prominent reasons for collecting in the late 1800s. Appadurai (1986:33) claims "[f]rom the social point of view, and over the span of human history, the critical agents for the articulation of the supply and demand of commodities have been not only rulers but, of course, *traders*". Therefore, individual collectors who act as traders are the primary resources and promoters for both the supply and the demand of artifacts. The collections they create and the demand they produce are representative of their own personal discernment and proclivities.

However, objects and artifacts can move from one sphere in their social lives to another. This is particularly true of archaeological artifacts in the United States, where they are removed from the indigenous context to a western capitalistic one.

During the rise of professional archaeology in the United States from the 1850s to 1910, the Frank Palmer archaeological collections and their meaning and value changed over time. The types of artifacts Palmer chose to include in his collections and the political and social environment that they were chosen within can illuminate aspects of the time period and the role that individual personalities and ambitions contributed to the development of archaeology and museums within the United States.

2.2 The Social Life of Artifacts

Historic research of artifacts and collections can help build a better picture of the provenance and provenience of both. This can construct the artifact's social life, where its value is determined in different contexts by the social, economic and cultural forces surrounding it.

Igor Kopytoff also discusses the commodization of objects. To summarize his views, he was interested in how different societies decide what they value as commodities. Kopytoff claimed that objects and cultural practices, similarly to people, have cultural biographies. Kopytoff expanded on Marx's definition of commodity as claiming it is "an item with use value that also has exchange value" (Kopytoff 1986:64). The use value and exchange value are concepts pulled from Marxian thought where the object has value by its use. For Western museums, that use would primarily be display, education and research. The exchange value is determined by what the objects will be exchanged for, normally a monetary process in the United States.

The main question Kopytoff posed is how or why are some objects are valued as commodities within a culture and some are not? He wrote: "From a cultural perspective, the production of commodities is also a cultural and cognitive process: commodities must

be not only produced materially as things, but also culturally marked as being a certain kind of thing” (Kopytoff 1986:64). In the situation of archaeological artifact collections, the value is culturally based and can be determined by how much it is willing to be exchanged for and what use it is as an educational, interesting or intact enough for display.

Kopytoff also urges his readers to consider examining objects anthropologically similarly to how people have been analyzed. This approach entails considering the cultural implications and contexts of the objects to discern the biography of the object.

Kopytoff claimed:

Biographies of things can make salient what might otherwise remain obscure. For example, in situations of culture contact, they can show what anthropologists have so often stressed: that what is significant about the adoption of alien objects- as of alien ideas- is not the fact that they are adopted, but the way they are culturally redefined and put to use.
[Kopytoff 1986:67]

The biography of the object is therefore how the object is transformed by the society/culture that it is in. For an object moving from one social sphere to another, the biography and value changes during the process in which the object is selected and made into a commodity. This is the process of singling out an object because of its unique qualities, whatever that may be; where the object is removed from the more common objects and is set apart from them (Kopytoff 1986:68-70).

If the setting apart process of actively collecting removes objects from the profane to the sacred, by selecting them, then the objects are representations of what is valued by the collector, who is influenced by their culture. Pearce furthers this idea when she wrote, “If the sacred-making process of selection expresses the subjective or psychological needs of the collector, we have to ask how it is that

certain objects attract the selection process and others do not, and this brings us to questions of perceived value and how value is created” (Pearce 1995:25).

Therefore, the construction of the biography of objects can tell researchers about the context in which they existed. In this situation, for the purposes of this research, that means the archaeological artifacts that were collected by Frank Palmer in the late 1800s and early 1900s.

2.3 The Smithsonian and the Bureau of American Ethnology

Turning to museums and institutions in the United States in the mid-eighteen hundreds will provide the context for Frank Palmer, his collections and the Southwest Society. In 1850, when Frank Palmer was born, the archaeological profession was not yet fully developed. Ethnologist Henry Rowe Schoolcraft gave a speech in 1846 in Rochester urging scientists and the interested populace to focus their studies on the United States rather than the distant regions in which anthropology and archaeology were focused at the time- namely classical locations (Hinsley 1981:20). However, “Schoolcraft’s optimism embraced various subfields of the science of man: physiology, history, archaeology, geography, and geology” (Hinsley 1981:21). It is evident that the anthropological discipline was not yet focused at this time given the breadth of fields that Schoolcraft highlighted. The boundaries of what constituted anthropology in the mid-century were not clearly delineated; neither were the methodologies for conducting archaeological, ethnographic, or museological work. This confused and varied approach to anthropology clearly demonstrates the non-professional status of the discipline in the mid 1800s.

Indeed, the concept of museums within the United States was still fairly young as well as the concept of anthropology. It was with the establishment of the Bureau of American Ethnology (BAE) in 1879 within the Smithsonian institution (founded 1846) by Congress that the beginnings of the anthropological discipline emerged (Woodbury and Woodbury 1999:284). Many parallels can be made between the Smithsonian and the British Museum. Both of these institutions were the first of their kind within their nations, and the importance of individuals in each institution as the guides for object acquisition research aims can be seen.

Joseph Henry was the first Secretary (the equivalent of a modern day museum director) of the Smithsonian. One of Henry's main goals was that research and analysis should be scientific (Hinsley 1981:28). Additionally, he was a physicist and "was ambivalent about the independence of a field that he always viewed as burdened with unwarranted speculation and consequently in need of purging and guidance" when discussing anthropology (Hinsley 1981:35).

Henry was not opposed to anthropology in general and was actually supportive of Edwin H. Davis and Ephraim George Squier's *Ancient Monuments of the Valley* manuscript that they produced from both men's explorations into the earthworks of Ohio and the Mississippi valleys (Barnhart 2005:45). However, Henry rigorously edited the volume in order to remove all speculation and conjecture, so that the final printed version would be more scientific than what the two men had originally submitted (Barnhart 2005:45). This is because, as Hinsley (1981:35) states, "of its status in 1846 as a field on the fringes of science, anthropology presented an unusual opportunity for making a science, for drawing a clear line between speculative popularization or

commercial humbuggery, and a sober search for truth”. Henry took this opportunity seriously and was instrumental in creating a more scientific framework for ethnology and archaeology in the mid-century.

Henry created a network that encouraged people to send in artifacts, specimens and information to the Smithsonian, which was part of his greater plan to collect and diffuse scientific information to the American public (Judd 1967:112-115; Hinsley 1981). Additionally, exchange of artifacts became standard practices between institutions as a way of exchanging information (Nichols 2014:225). These are the clear origins for professional standards of disseminating scientific information to the relevant community.

By the 1860s, Henry had established the Smithsonian in the center of an intellectual network. Hinsley claims that “[t]he Smithsonian facilitated the flow of information: instructions and forms went from analysts to explorers, data traveled back from the field. To ensure scientific respectability of materials, Henry submitted them to recognized authorities for review” (Hinsley 1981:48). This is the beginning of the peer-review process still in place today for the proper dissemination and evaluation of research (Goldstein 1994:576).

The BAE was formed within the Smithsonian in 1879 (Judd 1967:3). Ethnology was an umbrella discipline at the time, under which all things Native American were lodged, making it a synonym to how we view the anthropological discipline today. Although interested in archaeology, the BAE focused on linguistic and ethnographic fieldwork for much of its tenure (Snead 2001:8). One main product that the BAE produced, as dictated by Congress, was a series of lengthy annual reports regarding Native American. These publications helped to introduce Native Americans along with

their culture and history to the public and policy makers, and moreover, in particular, the government saw the BAE as a resource for Indian affairs (Woodbury and Woodbury 1999:287). Thus, the BAE was considered the expert source on all matters Native American before the turn of the century.

John Wesley Powell became the director of the BAE and the United States Geological Survey (USGS) in 1894, and under his leadership, the BAE and their investigations into Native American culture and artifacts that interest in the Southwest began to increase (Judd 1967:4; Trigger 1996:184). Powell was influential and integral to the trajectory of the BAE (Trigger 1996:184). Woodbury and Woodbury wrote, “[s]ince its beginning, the intellectual thrust of the Bureau was shaped by Powell’s enthusiasm for Lewis Henry Morgan’s theory of cultural evolution, which presented human advancement in stages” (Woodbury and Woodbury 1999:284). These early theoretical influences and research trajectories helped to lead to increased institutional support and made the Smithsonian and the BAE authorities in anthropology in the United States.

The idea of manifest destiny and the settling of the western portions of the United States during this time created the idea that Native Americans and their lifeways would soon be wiped out by the process of assimilation to the white westerners’. This created salvage ethnography, of which Powell approved of since he was intently interested in Native Americans (Judd 1967:4; Woodbury and Woodbury 1999:285).

Powell grew the staff of the BAE from eight men to twenty, including William Henry Holmes who would become the next major figure at the BAE. Powell was interested in recording Native American languages, but Spencer Fullerton Baird, who succeeded Henry as Secretary of the Smithsonian, demanded that artifacts be collected

for the National Museum. Therefore, Powell had to ensure that the BAE continued on its ethnographic missions as well as collecting artifacts (Judd 1967:3-12; Woodbury and Woodbury 1999:285-286). The BAE created a new supply of objects to study and display, and the Smithsonian and the BAE became the leading authority on collecting practices and anthropological processes from 1850 to the early 1900s.

Another influential eastern institution was the Archaeological Institute of America (AIA), which was founded in 1879 in Boston (Allen 2002:7). The AIA focused its initial aims on establishing an American presence in classical archaeology and maintained an early presence in Greece and Italy, rather than focusing on archaeology within the United States (Grummond 2002:43). The AIA established research bases in these countries for archaeology, sponsored classical archaeological digs and was immensely interested in publishing the results of archaeological projects from around the world (Allen 2002:8).

Charles Eliot Norton, the first president of the AIA, founded the *American Journal of Archaeology* in 1885 (Grummond 2002:43). Norton, and his personal aims and ambitions, helped to develop the unique trajectory that the AIA followed, much like Henry did for the Smithsonian. One researcher wrote that, “[t]he very uniqueness of the AIA among the learned societies of America is arguably an extension of Norton’s rare versatility” (Will 2002:49). During the time of the founding of the AIA, Norton was a household name that embodied his diverse set of interests (Will 2002:50). However, as Will (2002:50) notes, “Norton’s fame has diminished, fluctuated, and changed in character with the passage of time, probably in part because of the very diversity of his interests makes it difficult to remember him”.

By 1880 the AIA had largely abandoned American archaeology and left those practices to the Smithsonian and the BAE. However, the AIA did create professional publications and sponsored archaeological digs that would come to characterize the professionalism of the discipline. Additionally, the AIA would come to allow for local archaeological societies in the United States that paid dues to the AIA and would be considered affiliate societies (Snead 2002:125). These affiliate societies, particularly the Southwest Society in Los Angeles, would help change the course of some of the research aims of the AIA to more American pursuits (Snead 2002:125-136).

2.4 Influential Individuals

The Smithsonian and the BAE were instrumental in bringing about clear boundaries to the different subfields, and in establishing professional standards within these subfields. However, the aims of early anthropology within the United States were varied in their research topics and fieldwork approaches. Influential individuals guided these institutions and formed the early trajectory that their research would go. The distinct differences between different researchers and their personal ambitions were reflected in the discipline since people were allowed to follow whatever pursuit they fancied- if they were in a position of power or had access to institutional funds or a wealthy patron.

Outside of the discipline, individuals were free to conduct any explorations they chose. However, a lack of financial backing often-plagued individuals and their explorations remained amateur at best. Additionally, few positions for archaeologists, ethnographers and anthropologists in general were funded during this time period, prior to the incorporation of the BAE. Those who did receive funding received it based on their

reputation. According to Hinsley: “[s]cientific (like artistic) interests came relatively late to organizational maturity. Consequently, members of the scientific community of midcentury were often forced to rely as much on personal judgments of character as on formal organizational affiliation for identity and mutual recognition” (Hinsley 1981:19). Therefore, professional qualifications for the very competitive fields in anthropology were highly subjective.

Charles Rau was born in Belgium in 1926 and was interested in American archaeology (Kelly 2002:117). He sent archaeological artifacts to Joseph Henry at the Smithsonian and wrote many articles and publications on his archaeological investigations (Kelly 2002). He worked for most of his life attempting to gain scientific standing and gainful employment as an anthropologist. Lacking a wealthy financial backer, Rau, like many potential archaeologists in the mid-century, struggled throughout his life to obtain and secure a paying job within the field until Henry employed him to analyze artifacts within the Smithsonian (Hinsley 1981:46). Kelly (2002) wrote of Rau as a man who influenced many key individuals involved in archaeology at the time (Kelly 2002:117). However, he struggled to stay relevant and procure steady funding for his archaeological career.

Hinsley (1981:46-47) pointed out that for many, “the study of any branch of anthropology provided a livelihood for only a handful; for others it was either an avocation or a struggle”. Rau’s story of the struggle to find employment was a common one for the time period. The majority of research and fieldwork done, prior to 1879, was mainly by individuals with interests in anthropology who lacked the clear leadership and

rigorous scientific inquiry that later institutions would provide and were often called relic hunters.

In their national and religious quest, American investigators at mid-century followed three distinct routes: archaeology, philology, and physical anthropology. The lack of consensus on method, untapped sources of data, and the relative lack of institutional structures and professional criteria created a sense of openness and lively competition that would characterize the subfields of anthropology in this country to the end of the century. [Hinsley 1981:23]

The interplay of the beginnings of professionalism from the BAE and the free reign of the amateur explorer created an interesting dynamic in the United States during this time.

James Snead, in his book *Ruins and Rivals*, outlines the rise of professional archaeology in the southwest. Snead has “identified three critical elements of the history of Southwest archaeology within the scholarly-public interaction has been particularly important:

patronage, professionalism, and rationale” (Snead 2001:xviii). For many at this time, patronage, or the funding of archaeological endeavors by a wealthy individual, was a rare and wonderful occurrence. Additionally, Snead (2001:xx) notes that archaeology in the early 19th century was practiced by “generalists who conducted their studies as avocations rather than career”. This left the field open to a variety of individuals with varying degrees of interest, education, experience and personal aims. This leads into Snead’s last category, that of rationale. The rationale for individuals in conducting archaeology, and for amassing objects for collecting, was just as variable as the individuals who were participating in these endeavors. Moreover, Snead claimed that these three interactions were competitive and therefore the primary drives that lead to the rise of professional archaeology in the Southwest.

Frederick Ward Putnam was one individual who was backed by an institution and who revolutionized the professionalization of archaeology within the United States who saw opportunity in the American Southwest (Snead 2001:8). He was the curator at the Peabody Museum at Harvard University from 1875- 1909 and was a professor of ethnology and archaeology at Harvard from 1887-1909 (Kehoe 1999:19). Kehoe (1999:19) claims that he “assiduously constructed a structure for archaeology in America that subordinated museums to university graduate departments in the institutionalization of the field”. Putnam’s generation had education that highlighted scientific degrees such as biology or physics or being a naturalist. Degrees within the field of anthropology were soon in demand, although Putnam and his program remained very small for many years. And since, as Kehoe (1999:20) claims, “[t]he underbelly of professionalization is the exclusion of the uncredentialed, superficially a wise protection especially in a destructive endeavor such as archaeology”, it served to weed out the less educated persons from the official professional discourse.

By 1893, the time of the Chicago World Fair, the Peabody Museum was the only other anthropological institution on par with the Smithsonian in Washington (McVicker 1999:37). McVicker (1999:37) noted that at this point, “[t]hese two centers balanced and complemented each other, one public institution and one private university, each having attached museums”. This pattern continued to grow in the United States with museums arising from coast to coast by 1904, and with universities as competing institutions. This created a wider arena for competition since, as McVicker (1999:37) notes, “[a]s new networks developed around museums and universities, members of the established networks attempted to manipulate them and maintain control of the field”.

Part of this manipulation involved recognizing opportunities within the anthropological field, as disparate as it was at this time. Much like Joseph Henry who recognized important trends in anthropology, Putnam also recognized the importance of the Southwest for archaeologists, and thus, began early collecting from the Southwest (Snead 2001:8). Thus, Putnam was ahead of others in his field during this time.

Franz Boas, an understudy of Putnam's, was also incredibly influential in the development of trajectory of American Anthropology. As Jerry Moore wrote, "Franz Boas (1858-1942) shaped the direction of 20th-century American anthropology...[his] influence was institutional, intellectual, and personal" (Moore 1997:42). Both Putnam and Boas have been credited for advancing academic endeavors for early anthropologists in the United States (Thoresen 1975:261). Thus, Putnam and Boas were the standard of professionalism for anthropologists, archaeologists and museum curators, and were responsible for many of their educations in these fields.

Richard Wetherill and his family provide an apt foil to Putnam and Boas' careers during this time. Wetherill was a relic hunter who collected artifacts for selling or trade in Colorado beginning around 1883 (McKnitt 1966:27; Snead 2001:18; Woodbury 1959). Snead (2001:18) claimed that he was "[a]stute in reaping the benefit of important archaeological discoveries and in developing his own network of patronage and support, [and] Wetherill embodied the conflict between science and commerce, and between western relic hunter and eastern museum man". Wetherill gave tours of ruins and even excavated Mesa Verde with other relic hunters. He helped to generate a market for southwestern artifacts and became quite noteworthy for his efforts (Snead 2001).

To-date, Wetherill's excavation efforts have been deplored for being unscientific and unprofessional (McNitt 1966:33). However, as Snead (2001:20) notes, "[e]xposure to the techniques of contemporary archaeology ultimately came in the summer of 1891, when the Wetherills dug in the Mesa Verde ruins with the Swedish traveler Gustav Nordenskiöld". Nordenskiöld had scientific training and education and he showed the Wetherills how to keep notes and excavate methodology (Snead 2001:20). Richard Wetherill eventually began to publish his findings in journals. He also sought funding from the Smithsonian and from Harvard for his southwester explorations, although they were rejected (McNitt 1966:36). His excavations by today's standards are considered unscientific, however, by the standards of his day, he had become quite acceptable (McNitt 1966:33).

Snead (2001:21) points out that this is an example of "[t]he flexibility of the mid-nineteenth century, which had allowed military officers, natural scientists, and amateur travelers to contribute to the study of the southwestern past, was giving way to a more structured professional system" as the 1890s. The professional framework was emphasizing training, copious note taking, rigorous excavations and sharing/publication of finds over the amateur's haphazard digging.

By the 1890s, the BAE and the Smithsonian had helped to rapidly develop the anthropological discipline by bringing about discipline and standards (Hinsley 1981:86). Hinsley (1981:86) asserts that prior to 1890, "its various branches had been dominated by individuals working for selfish, partial ends and generalizing from incomplete, private collections". Having an organization with clear definitions and goals, provided a working framework for professionals.

2.5 Early Archaeologists in California

Thus far, much of the history of the origins of American anthropology has been focused in the eastern and southwestern portions of the United States, with little emphasis on individuals from California. Putting the history of collecting and influential professionals from California into context for this research is integral to understanding Frank Palmer and his collections.

One of the most notable and well-known early collector of artifacts from California is the Reverend Stephen Bowers. He was a Methodist minister who, Smith (1983:26) claims, “unhesitatingly excavated and sifted the Santa Barbara Channel Islands for human skulls, arrowheads, spear points, bone implements, and other artifacts which he sold to eastern museums and collectors”. Indeed, Bowers was contracted by the Department of the Interior and by the Smithsonian in 1876 to collect artifacts from southern California localities (Benson 1997:9). In 1877, however, the French Academy of Science had an interest in Native California artifacts as well and also sought to excavate as many sites as quickly as possible to export to museums in Europe (Benson 1997:9-10). Bowers and the French effectively rushed to collect as many artifacts as possible. Benson (1997:11) notes that “[w]ithin six months nearly every known Chumash burial ground had been opened and the contents removed to museums on the East Coast and in Europe”.

Bowers had little published during his time as archaeologist/pot-hunter, but he did keep field-notes, although they were not released at the time or immediately afterwards. Additionally, “[t]he haphazard and unscientific nature of his archaeological “digs,”

however, earned him the nearly unanimous censure of succeeding generations of archaeologists and historians” (Smith 1983:26).

It is perhaps somewhat ironic that Bowers considered other untrained enthusiasts as “curiosity seekers” while he thought of himself as an authority with a legitimate claim on Native American artifacts. This is perhaps because he received an honorary doctorate degree from Willamette University in Oregon in the late 1800s for his pursuits and was a main contributor to the Smithsonian (Smith 1983:31). Interestingly, Frank Palmer claims to have had a friendship with Bowers around 1893 (Palmer BRL:1909a).

Some other notable early archaeologists working in California before 1890 were Paul Schumacher, Alexander S. Taylor, Harry Crecy Yarrow, Lorenzo Gordin Yates and Alphonse Pinart and Leon de Cessac. These individuals worked on many of the same locations that Frank Palmer collected from- from Santa Rosa Island, to San Nicolas Island to coastal sites from Santa Barbara to Los Angeles (Benson 1997:13-17). Many of them published articles in newspapers or journals, conducted ethnographic fieldwork, and kept field notes, although they were not as meticulous as what is considered standard present-day practice (Benson 1997:18). By the 1900s many of these practices were becoming more refined. It is also prudent to note that, other than competition for collecting artifacts for museums and personal curiosity, these men had no research goals.

By 1900, focused efforts of establishing directed anthropological studies began to occur in Northern California. It was not until Phoebe Hearst and Henry Wheeler, along with Putnam and Kroeber, established the Anthropology Department at University of California, Berkeley in 1901, that directed research on California Native Americans was developed (Thoresen 1975:266; Jacknis 2002:523). It was particularly Kroeber, and his

interest in Native California languages and ethnographies that focused on Native Californians that helped to drive this effort (Thoresen 1975:271).

Kroeber was most certainly an educated man. He learned museum and archaeological practices from both Putnam and Boas (Jacknis 2002:524). He focused on Native California tribes and even wrote the *Handbook of the Indians of California* in 1925, although he began planning for the book as early as 1903 (Jacknis 2002:525). The founding of the anthropology department at Berkeley was not without its own problems. Boas, Putnam, Wheeler and Kroeber had differing views on how to teach and on what to focus on for research. Their story is another example of how, as Thorseen (1975:257) points out, “[t]he competition and conflict of interest among those individuals is outlined as part of a larger historical episode in the professionalization of anthropology”.

While this was occurring in Northern California, the story in the southern part of the state was quite different. In 1880 Los Angeles was a burgeoning city with all the hallmarks of an emerging metropolis. The infrastructure for public transportation was established, large construction projects were underway and the entertainment industry was booming. What Los Angeles did not have, however, was a museum. It was not until 1903 that the newly formed Southwest Society brought together a group of dynamic and often difficult individuals to focus on the dream of building a museum in the city.

This museum, which would become the Southwest Museum, would be the first of its kind in Los Angeles, contributing to the west coast’s development of museums’ archaeological collecting practices. The collections that the museum would come to obtain would serve to promote the institution both regionally, and nationally.

Chapter 3: Frank Palmer

3.1 Introduction to Frank Palmer and the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce

Frank M. Palmer was born around 1850 in New York, to English immigrants. He married Katherine Palmer around 1880 after moving to California. had two children, both born in Los Angeles, Marion Francis and Frank Palmer (Frank was obviously a family name). Little is known about Frank Palmer's movements in the early days of his life in California. However, in 1888 Palmer was one of five men who incorporated the Los Angeles Dental Association since he was a dentist by trade (Los Angeles Times, "Southern California Dentists" November 19, 1891).

It is apparent that upon arriving in California, Palmer sought to become involved in many different aspects of the development of societies in Los Angeles. This is perhaps most evident in the fact that Palmer also had an avid interest in the history and artifacts of Native Californians. Frank Palmer is mentioned as one of the twelve people involved in the initial organization of the Historical Society of California in 1875 (Levering 1893:9). He also began collecting artifacts, an activity documented as early as 1877. Thus, it is understandable that Palmer's interest and involvement with history and archaeology would only increase over time.

Where and when Palmer collected his artifacts remains difficult to pin down. "For 15 years past Dr. Palmer has been engaged upon his labor of love" and thus, many of the dates fall within a range (Los Angeles Herald, "Then There were Indians" November 15, 1893). These dates range from 1876 to 1878, but the most common date found was 1877 and is thus used. Palmer is most closely associated with an ancient Native American

village site (CA-LAN-127) at Redondo Beach, which became known as the “Palmer-Redondo Site,” where he conducted work for some decades.

Around 1895-1896, however, Frank Palmer decided to sell his collection, a decision attributable to financial constraints. He wrote:

It is well known to the people of this community, also to a great many of the scholarly men and women of the state, and nation, that during this period of more than one fourth of a century, I devoted a very considerable portion of my time, and money, and personal effort to making an exhaustive exploration of the prehistoric village sites, workshops, and cemeteries of the Southern Californian Indians. [Palmer BRL:1906a]

Palmer desperately wanted to keep the collection in Los Angeles, so made an agreement with Jonathon S. Slauson that the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce would raise exactly \$1500.00 in order to purchase the artifacts. How exactly Mr. Slauson raised the funds is not known other than “by subscription” (Lummis BRL:1906).

The Palmer collection was then held in trust at the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce until a suitable museum could be constructed in which to house the artifacts. It was very important to the Chamber of Commerce that a ‘fire-proof’ building be found or erected in order to house the artifacts. It is also relevant to note that Mr. Slauson was the president of the Southwest Society at the time of purchase of the artifacts as well as being associated with the Chamber of Commerce. In 1903 Palmer and the Southwest Society added to the collection at the Chamber of Commerce from his finds at the Palmer-Redondo site, which he originally found and collected from in 1877 (Los Angeles Times “Rare Relics for Museum” September 24, 1909) (Los Angeles Herald, “Then There were Indians” November 15, 1893).

The Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce collection is the Palmer Collection that is made up from artifacts Palmer collected and purchased from southern California sites,

and also the later finds from Redondo Beach. The time frame for collecting for this collection was 1877 to 1896, and 1903.

3.2 Introduction to the Southwest Society

In addition to his collecting activities, Frank Palmer was part of the Executive Committee of the Southwest Society. Formed in 1903, the organization was a group of diverse individuals that came together with the goal of establishing a museum in Los Angeles. Moreover, the members of the Southwest Society sought to promote Los Angeles as a western city that had influence, culture and society to rival those already established in the East. They sought to accomplish this through their mutual interest in the history of the southwest and by acquiring Native American artifacts for education and display. The Constitution of the Southwest Society states the ambitions and goals of the Society as:

The object of the Southwest Society of the Archaeological Institute of America shall be in general to forward the aims of the Institute; and in particular to stimulate and prosecute study and exploration of the American Southwest; to assemble and preserve the fruits of such research; and to conduct this study of “The Works of Men Before Us,” ... this Society shall have power to conduct excavations; to gather, acquire and have charge of, archaeological, ethnological and other collections; to record folklore, folk-songs, vocabularies and the like... [No Author BRL:1903]

It is evident from this document that archaeology and ethnographic research were important goals. However, the Society’s interests were more broadly anthropological in scope, also emphasizing recording of folklore and songs and the interest in linguistics. These wide ranging subjects allowed the Southwest Society to attract a wide audience in Los Angeles with the promise of scientific research and sensational reporting on the past and present of Southwest Native Americans. They began acquiring paying members who

were also interested in the history and preservation of Native American artifacts, and began releasing publications in their Southwest *Bulletins* and their magazine, *Out West*, almost immediately. More notably, the Southwest Society began to send Palmer out on expeditions for the purpose of collecting artifacts for the museums.

Palmer was enthusiastic about the Southwest Society and was integral in its formation as both the collector providing one of the founding collections and a member of the Executive Committee. In an article that Palmer penned for a Southwest *Bulletin* he described his fascination with the artifacts produced by the Native Americans of California. He wrote that the artifacts he collected from Southern California were “in perfection of design and workmanship [that] are unsurpassed by the productions of any of the native races ever inhabiting other sections of the United States, and in many important features their preeminence is conclusively demonstrated” (Palmer BRL:1905b). His passion and zeal for Southern Californian Native American artifacts is evident in this passage.

Although the core of Palmer’s collection came from his work at Redondo Beach, he also collected from San Diego, San Bernardino, Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, San Clemente Island, Catalina, San Nicolas Island, Santa Rosa Island, Santa Cruz Island and San Miguel Island. He sold some of the artifacts that he collected from these areas to Wilbur Dudley Campbell (1858-1942) in 1892 (Palmer BRL:1909f). Campbell owned a store where he sold ‘curiosities’ and was an avid artifact collector himself (Campbell BRL:1892). Due to a severe illness, Campbell sold the collection, which he had renamed the Palmer-Campbell collection to reflect his own contributions. After recovering, Campbell attempted to re-acquire the Palmer-Campbell collection in

order for the Southwest Society to procure it (Campbell BRL:1892). It is unclear if Campbell was going to donate the recovered collection or whether he expected the Southwest Society to purchase it, but is most likely that Charles Lummis purchased it (Campbell BRL:1892).

In a letter Palmer wrote in 1909, he claimed “The ‘Palmer-Campbell’ collection purchased for \$350 was made by me, and sold to Mr. Campbell sixteen years ago for \$800” (Palmer BRL:1909f). Thus, it is known that the Palmer-Campbell collection was originally purchased, at least in part, and was probably contributed to by Palmer with his personally collected objects, and was sold in 1892 to Campbell. Additionally, it demonstrates that Palmer purchased artifacts as well as collecting them himself to form his collections.

Buying and selling of Native American artifacts and collections is a recurring theme in the story of Frank Palmer and the Southwest Museum. In a letter Palmer penned to Dr. Hector Alliot in December of 1909, he wrote:

During [my] experience of more than forty years as a collector, I have made it an invariable rule never to purchase a collection or even single specimens by reason of opinions held, or statements made by the persons who had collected them. Briefly, unless I had personal information enabling me to identify and define the collections or specimens, I did not buy them. [Palmer BRL:1909f]

This quote is interesting for two reasons: first that buying and selling of artifacts was common practice for collectors, even those that went into the field themselves to collect; and secondly, that Palmer thought that he could properly classify archaeological artifacts. In this quote, Palmer attempts to demonstrate his expertise for Native American material culture.

In 1907 the Southwest Society opened its first free museum exhibit at the Pacific Electric Building in downtown Los Angeles, open from 2 to 4 pm Monday through Saturday. The Southwest Society often referred to the Pacific Electric exhibit as the “Southwest Museum.” Palmer subsequently became the Southwest Society’s curator and main contributor of archaeological artifacts. His change in status within the framework of the Southwest Society is noteworthy. Palmer flung himself into the role whole-heartedly, quitting his profession of dentistry in order to focus his time and efforts into his new occupation. Additionally, he was the only member of the Southwest Society during this time that was garnering a paycheck for his contributions (Lummis BRL:1909f).

Among his duties was to be present at the Pacific Electric Building during the two hours a day that it was open, Monday through Saturday. He was also charged with cataloguing his collection and any other collection that the Society acquired. Interestingly, the partially re-acquired Palmer-Campbell collection was on display at the Pacific Electric Building as of 1907.

3.3 Museum Expeditions and the Growth of the Southwest Society

The board of directors of the Southwest Society wasted no time in organizing expeditions and publications, and even organized and executed two museum-led field expeditions in 1905. Among the Executive Committee members of the Southwest Society besides Palmer, two emerge prominently in this story. They are Charles Lummis and Mary Foy (See Gordon 1959; Apostol 1996). They enacted and bankrolled the first expedition of the Southwest Society, led by Frank Palmer, in 1905 to the Palmer-Redondo site.

Immediately following the Redondo Beach expedition, Palmer was sent to Navajo County in Arizona for the second and third museum-led expeditions, which happened in the summers of 1905 and 1906 respectively. The Society, creatively called these the “First Arizona Expedition” and the “Second Arizona Expedition” (Lummis BRL:1907f; Palmer BRL:1907:a).

It is impressive that the Southwest Society was able to fund, organize and execute these early expeditions so quickly after their incorporation. By 1907, the membership had increased to 400 individuals, and Lummis had already enacted his ‘catching archaeology alive’ initiative by recording over 600 folk songs from both Spanish and Native American peoples (Lummis BRL:1907c). It was Lummis’s contention that native peoples in the United States were disappearing by assimilation and that the best way in which to preserve the past would be to record the present- hence, catching archaeology alive. This campaign was garnering favorable attention from society members (Snead 2003:70-71; Lummis BRL:1909c).

In addition, the Society had expanded its collections to include historic paintings and mission era artifacts. Two full *bulletins* had already been produced, as well as a variety of other publications through various avenues. A statewide lecture tour also took place (Lummis BRL:1907g). In the process they had also established a strong relationship with the BAE and had become an affiliated society of the AIA.

Lastly, and quite importantly, the Board of Directors, under the guidance of Charles Lummis, had found and purchased a location for their permanent museum that was to be called the Southwest Museum. Lummis laid out the goals of the Southwest Society in the 1907 *Bulletin*: “The work of the Southwest Society is to the advancement

of science and scholarship throughout the world, but with first reference to this community in which all the visible results of its explorations will be held as an eternal trust for the Southwest Museum” (Lummis BRL:1907g).

The overnight success of the Southwest Society was well chronicled in contemporary newspaper articles, letters and in speeches and lectures. Palmer wanted to establish a free museum in Los Angeles that would rival the institutions in the east. He found a partner for this ambitious endeavor in Charles Lummis. Both saw the value in the Palmer-Campbell Collection and the Palmer Collection as the founding collections of their museum. In fact, Lummis desired that the Southwest Museum not only house and display artifacts, but should also serve as training institution for archaeologists (Lummis BRL:1907a). Lummis wrote in favor of having an archaeological school in Los Angeles saying, “[t]he social, artistic, esthetic and educational advantages are, beyond comparison, greater here; the liberality and the means of this community are without rival” (Lummis BRL:1907a).

Palmer also desired to be a professional archaeologist and curator and sought to prove his professional worth through his publications and lectures. He wrote, “He who can play while he works, knows how good it is to be alive” (Palmer BRL:1905b). The Southwest Society and the establishment of a museum in Los Angeles were of paramount importance to him personally and professionally. This is especially true, since he was a novice in the field with no formal education and no previous institutional affiliation, Palmer was using his impressive collection of southern Californian Native American artifacts to first get into the Southwest Society and gain notoriety within the field.

3.4 Charles Fletcher Lummis

It is not clear how Charles Lummis and Frank Palmer met, but what is known is that they knew each other by 1896 when they were attempting to get the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce to purchase the Palmer Collection. Lummis was born in 1859 in Massachusetts to a scholar father (Newmark 1950:45; Gordon 1959:306). He is most famous for his ‘tramp across the continent’ in 1884, when he decided to walk from Ohio to California and write weekly news articles for the Los Angeles Times about his adventures (Newmark 1950:47; Gordon 1959:307). He continued to have many exploits over the years as both a prolific writer and adventurer. He even lived with the Isleta tribe where he fought against the United States Indian education campaign that was removing native children from their parents (Newmark 1950:47-48). Lummis won the battle against the United States government, and later went to Peru to assist Adolph Bandelier, an archaeologist, in his efforts, although Bandelier thought Lummis was conceited (Lange and Riley 1996:134-135; Newmark 1950:50; Gordon 1959:308). By 1894 he was settled back in Los Angeles as a magazine editor and began his efforts to establish a free museum for the populace of Los Angeles.

Lummis was known to have many interpersonal conflicts with such influential persons, including Alfred Kroeber (Snead 2003:73), Bandelier (Lange and Riley 1996:162-163), and others (Chauvenet 1983:41). Despite this tendency, Lummis managed to garner social clout in matters of politics and policies, particularly those that regarded Native Americans. In fact, President Theodore Roosevelt and Lummis shared a friendship after meeting during their college education at Harvard University. Indeed, Gordon (1959:306) claimed that “[w]hile writing *The Winning of the West*, Teddy

frequently drew upon Lummis' knowledge of Spanish, and years later President Roosevelt called Lummis to Washington to advise him on Western affairs in general and on Indian affairs in particular". It was Lummis's lifelong love of Native American culture and history and the American southwest that drew him to Palmer, and eventually helped fuel their inevitable fallout.

3.5 The Friendship of Palmer and Lummis

Charles Lummis was a man of considerable influence in Los Angeles at the time of the formation of the Southwest Society (1903). His exploits and publications made him popular and as such, his social reach was impressive. Although Lummis was the secretary of the Southwest Society, he also oversaw membership, edited and the Southwest society's *Bulletins* and controlled the finances of the organization. It is important to note that the secretary position was a very important and high-level position within the society, equivalent to a Museum Director.

From 1895 to about 1907 the interests of Palmer and Lummis were aligned. Both desired the Palmer Collection to stay in Los Angeles and both worked toward the establishment of free museum in Los Angeles, and both sought to grow the prestige and reach of the Southwest Society.

In 1905 Lummis sought permission to conduct research on Indian reservations and on public lands, which, at the time, was a privilege that was solely given to the Bureau of Ethnography and the Smithsonian Museum. After being rebuffed in his few initial attempts to gain access by Francis E. Leupp, the Commissioner of Indian Affairs at the Department of the Interior, Lummis wrote to President Theodore Roosevelt, calling him "My dear Mr. Roosevelt", requesting he override the latter's decision (Lummis

BRL:1905c). President Roosevelt obliged and forthwith, Lummis wrote to Palmer saying, “Everything is coming our way. There is not a hitch in our gallop; and I think that in a very short time we shall have the active campaign for funds advancing all along the line” (Lummis BRL:1905a).

Leupp wrote to President Roosevelt to complain about Lummis’ going over his head and directly imploring both the President and the BAE. Roosevelt forwarded the letter on to Lummis, and Lummis, in turn wrote a response to Leupp, saying, “I am more than sorry that you deemed my letter to the President a *needlessly sensational attack*” (Lummis BRL:1905b). This is an excellent example of Lummis using his connections to achieve his goals and circumvent those who stood in his way. Armed with Lummis’ connections and unrelenting determination, the duo appeared to be unstoppable for their mission to create an upstanding institution in southern California.

3.6 The Frank Palmer Archaeology Collections

Over time Palmer made three collections that were donated or sold separately. The Palmer-Campbell collection on display in the Pacific Electric Building, the Palmer Collection held in trust in the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce and lastly, the Palmer Redondo High School collection, which he donated to the school in 1917. It is prudent to note that the Palmer collection held in the Chamber of Commerce was collected by Palmer prior to 1896, but was added to in 1903 with artifacts from Redondo Beach (Los Angeles Times, “Rarest Relics Found for Finest Museum” September 24, 1903). However, both the Palmer-Campbell collection and the Palmer collection are the Frank Palmer Archaeology Collections that are the topics of this thesis. The smaller Redondo High School Collection is not included due to lack of access and the extreme

deterioration of the objects themselves and their complete lack of provenance and provienenance.

In 1906 Lummis and Palmer asked the Chamber of Commerce to release the Palmer collection to the Southwest Society. They refused, stating that they had yet to procure a fireproof building and that the Southwest Society did not have a right to the collection. That this was ironic because, as Lummis pointed out in a letter addressed the Chamber of Commerce, that they had three fires since they took the collection in (Lummis BRL:1906). The Chamber of Commerce claimed they paid for the collection and since Mr. Slauson had since passed away, it was left to Palmer and Lummis to argue the legitimacy of the Southwest Society as owners of the Palmer collection. Palmer wrote a full 7 page typed letter to the Chamber, and in it he stated:

And again, at the time of the remarkable discovery made at Redondo Beach in 1903, I submitted to the Board of Directors of the Chamber of Commerce, the importance of active and sustained effort to preserve for the people of this community, objects of historic and scientific interest that are found here, and belong here, but which, with an indifference little short of imbecility, To the Directors, L.A. Chamber of Commerce.
[Palmer BRL:1906a:2-3]

In contrast to Palmer's ire-filled letter, Lummis was much more reserved with his language. He wrote, "It was fully understood by Mr. Slauson, Dr. Palmer, myself, and others concerned in this important transaction, that the Chamber of Commerce purchased this collection in trust for this community" (Lummis BRL:1906:2). The two men were united in their argument against the Chamber of Commerce and led the battle to regain their artifacts collectively.

It is possible that the Chamber of Commerce was reluctant to return the artifacts to the Southwest Society since the Chamber had received positive attention in the press

regarding the artifacts (11/8/1895 L.A. Herald “The Palmer Collection). However, The Southwest Society ended up paying the Chamber of Commerce for the collection, and it was transferred to the Southwest Museum in 1915.

Upon its arrival, the Palmer collection was integrated into the existing Palmer-Campbell collection where it became known as the Palmer Collection. The Palmer collection itself has a long and complicated history, including the buying and selling of artifacts as well as personal collecting trips and expeditions conducted by the amateur archaeologist himself. Table 1 depicts the timeline of Palmer’s collections and expeditions.

Table 1: Palmer Collections Timeline

Collection	Date	Notes
Palmer finds CA-LAN-127 and begins collecting from it	1877	
Palmer-Campbell Collection sold to Campbell (Palmer Collection 1)	1892	Sold by Palmer for financial reasons.
Palmer Collection in Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce (Palmer Collection 2)	1895-1896	Collected 1877-1896. Began displaying artifacts in 1895. Sold by Palmer to the Chamber for financial reasons.
Redondo Beach artifacts added to Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce Palmer Collection (Palmer Collection 2)	1903	Collected 1877-1896 and 1903
First Museum Expedition to Redondo Beach (M.1)	1905	Not thought to be incorporated into the ultimate 2.P. collection
Second Museum Expedition, Arizona "First Arizona Expedition" (M.2)	1905	Not thought to be incorporated into the ultimate 2.P. collection. Edgar Lee Hewett part of this expedition.
Third Museum Expedition, Arizona "Second Arizona Expedition" (M.3)	1906	Not thought to be incorporated into the ultimate 2.P. collection. Edgar Lee Hewett part of this expedition.
Southwest Society acquires Palmer-Campbell collection from Campbell (Palmer Collection 1)	1906-1907	
Palmer-Campbell Collection on display at Pacific Electric Building (Palmer Collection 1)	1907	
Southwest Museum opens it's doors in Mount Washington	1914	
Palmer Collection arrives at Southwest Museum in Mount Washington and becomes integrated with the Palmer-Campbell Collection and is re-named 2.P. (Palmer Collections 1 and 2 become integrated)	1915	
Palmer donates artifacts to Redondo High School (Palmer Collection 3)	1917	What is left of the Redondo High collection is at the Redondo Beach Historical Society. Currently on display.

3.7 Publicity and Public Acclaim for the Palmer Collections

The Palmer archaeology collections garnered a great deal of publicity. One newspaper article from 1895 wrote about Mr. Slauson's attempt to raise \$1500 for the Palmer Collection to be held in trust for at the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce (Los Angeles Herald, "Then There Were Indians" November 8, 1895). Another newspaper article in 1903 from the Los Angeles Times called "Rare Relics Found For Finest Museum" claims that the Palmer Collection in the Chamber of Commerce was worth \$15,000 alone, without the Palmer-Campbell collection (Los Angeles Times, "Rare Relics for Finest Museum" November 24, 1903). That is worth about \$400,000 in today's value! Another newspaper article from 1903 about the Palmer Collection claimed, "at Redondo-by-the-sea there have just been unearthed some of the most remarkable and interesting relics of early aboriginal inhabitants ever found in Southern California" (Los Angeles Times, "Archaeological Treasures Found at Redondo" June 14, 1903). Palmer's collections were gaining favorable recognition in newspapers and in other publications. In the Southwest Society's third Bulletin from 1907, Lummis wrote:

We have purchased the Palmer-Campbell and the Rutter Collections of Southern California archaeology. No other community in America has as complete, as scientific or as interesting a regional collection as this; and this has only one rival in the world- the Palmer collection, now held in trust by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, but pledged to the Southwest Museum [Lummis BRL 1907F:25]

The newspaper articles and publications reflect the value that the Southwest Society and general populace of Los Angeles assigned to the impressive Palmer collections. How then did these important and infamous collections become fragmented and forgotten?

Chapter 4: The Feud

4.1 The Feud

Although the goals of Frank Palmer and Charles Lummis were aligned for procuring collections, establishing a free museum and ensuring that the Southwest Society could rival any eastern society in publications and membership, their personal ambitions and differences in opinion led to conflict. A dispute between the two was inevitable, especially since Charles Lummis was famously argumentative (Chauvenet 1983:41). The episode is central to the story of Palmer's failure as a professional archaeologist and museum curator, and the fate of his collection. Indeed, the feud put the two men and their arguments over Palmer's professionalism onto a very public stage.

Although their dispute came to a head in 1909, the foundations of their infamous feud were laid down years prior. Among the things they argued about were the Southwest Society's membership to the AIA, Palmer's lack of professionalism, Lummis's apparent use of the Society's membership funds for personal gain, Lummis's close friendship with Edgar Lee Hewett, a professional archaeologist, and many others. It is the contention of this thesis that these conflicts, and their eventual eruption into the newspapers and other public forums, directly affected the future of the Palmer collections and contributed to the national conversation about professional standards for archaeologists and museum personnel.

These individual proclivities and ambitions of the people involved had a direct repercussion on the way the museum was founded and opened, and which collections came to prominence. Additionally, the feud was acknowledged and discussed within the anthropological discipline on a national stage, with key established professionals

weighing in. The feud, and the results of the discussions would come to help characterize the professionalism of the archaeological discipline within the United States.

4.2 Curatorial Responsibilities

First, Lummis found Palmer's work as a curator to be suspect. Palmer was constantly asking Lummis for cash advances and he expected the Southwest Society to furnish his office and home, which he considered was his "due" as the curator. Palmer was required to work for two hours, six days a week. He was also expected to show up to the committee meetings and write articles about the expeditions that the Southwest Society conducted. For the task of working 12 hours a week, Palmer was paid \$100 a month, which is the equivalent of \$2,631.58 in today's worth.

In addition, Palmer quit the dentist profession to focus on being an archaeologist, explorer and curator. The perhaps most perplexing part of his work is that Palmer never actually managed to catalogue his collection during the years that he served as curator. He was constantly requesting additional funds from Lummis for labels and other supplies, but never actually followed through the basic work of curating the collection. To add to this, Palmer was the only member of the Executive Committee that was paid salary or had their expenses covered (Lummis BRL:1909e;1909j;1909m; No Author BRL:1909e). Lummis claims that \$5000.00 had been spent on Palmer's salary and that not only did he not catalogue the collections, he also wasn't always present during his daily two hour tenure at the Edison Building, and that he failed to write timely scientific articles of the explorations of the Southwest Society (Lummis BRL:1909q). In a statement that Lummis wrote for the arbitration committee in July of 1909, Lummis wrote of his many issues with Palmer:

That is the only salaried Curator in the Archaeological Institute of America... That he does not work for his salary, which has now aggregated over \$5,000... During the rest of his tenure and salary, he has done practically nothing but keep the exhibit room open two hours a day, six days a week... In a majority of cases, these invited visitors receive no attention whatever from the Curator. His time in the rooms is mostly spent behind his desk; either brooding and inventing new trouble for the Society, or in conversation with some friend. [Lummis BRL:1909o]

Lummis's allegations against Palmer are much more than this quote shows, however. Lummis's argument to the Committee on Arbitration is quite long, and documents Palmer's failure to catalogue the collections, his lack of ability in acquiring new members for the Southwest Society, his lack of scientific articles, his lack of scientific credentials and ability, his lack of business acumen and his dramatic and self-entitled personality, among many other things (Lummis BRL:1909p).

4.3 Professional Publications and Forced Oversight

The AIA played an important role in the Lummis-Palmer controversy. Snead (2002:125) pointed out that in 1884, "the regulations of the Institute were revised to allow for affiliation with archaeological societies, which would apply for admittance, and through their dues and contributions would support the larger initiatives of the AIA". The AIA, in turn, oversaw potential publications, funded expeditions and supplies (albeit, very limitedly) and created a professional framework for the participating institutions to contribute to and interact within (Snead 2002:125).

By 1890, however, membership in the AIA was again dwindling and the increased interest in the archaeology of the American West became seen as an untapped resource. Francis Willey Kelsey, the AIA's secretary as of 1903, recruited western historical organizations as affiliates. This is noteworthy since, as Snead (2002:127) wrote, "Kelsey's efforts were most notable in Los Angeles, where he participated in the

founding of what was soon to be the largest affiliate within the Institute, the Southwest Society". Most of, if not all of, the other affiliates were from the East, which could have been one of the influential reasons for the Southwest Society to join in 1904 upon its official incorporation.

However, because of the unprecedented growth and popularity of the Southwest Society, and because of the Southwest Society's active collecting expeditions and publications, they quickly sought to renegotiate their terms with the Vice President of the AIA, Mr. C.P. Bowditch (No Author BRL:1906). This conversation is documented in meeting minutes from April 26, 1906, where it was proposed that in order for the Southwest Society to stay affiliated with the AIA, the terms of that affiliation must change. Namely, that the Southwest Society would retain more of its membership dues in order to conduct their own expeditions, purchase collections and give their own lectures rather than just contributing the AIA's. Mr. Bowditch expressed a concern as to how the AIA would ensure that the Southwest Society would keep its work professional. In turn, the Southwest Society suggested that "the society would throw its books open--- in other words, that the museum would be subject to the oversight of the Archaeological Institute of America, either direct or through scientific jury of national standing" (No Author BRL:1906). Although there is no mention of Palmer dissenting with these suggestions in the meeting minutes, he would grow to resent the AIA and voice his opinion of wanting the Southwest Society to withdraw from it.

Although the prestige that came from having the AIA logo stamped on every piece of the Southwest Society's stationary and publications was important to many members of the executive committee, Palmer did not care for the oversight of his work by

professionals within the field. This perhaps stems from an attempted publication by Palmer in 1907, “Observations on the Teeth of Pueblo and Cliff Dwellers”, which was deemed inappropriate for publication. Palmer had initially submitted it to William Henry Holmes, head of the BAE, who then submitted it to Dr. Ales Hrdlicka who was associated with the National Museum and the AIA. Holmes wrote to Palmer in a letter dated September 12, 1907, “It is apparent from Doctor Hrdlicka’s conversation that he believes your paper, published as at present, would meet with adverse criticism, as your observations of the phenomena involved have not been sufficiently extensive” (Holmes BRL:1907). The article was never published and there is no record of Palmer making further inquiries about it.

Frederick W. Hodge, the editor of *American Anthropologist*, and also an influential figure in the archaeological discipline at the time, disparaged Palmer’s publications. In a letter dated July 6, 1909, from Hodge to Lummis, he wrote, “The article impressed me very unfavorably... and [I] was particularly struck by the author’s ignorance of work done by others in the same locality... [he] would make a much better preparatory or Museum handyman than curator” (Hodge BRL:1909).

Publications and professionalism were closely tied together, even in 1909. Palmer’s lack of publications and ability to produce for publications was problematic for his career. The lack of confidence in his abilities to contribute to the discipline through publications and the subsequent sharing of knowledge was a hindrance to his standing in the field. Lummis argued many times that Palmer either did not produce his results from the field in a timely manner or that he did not write for the *Out West* magazines when asked (Lummis BRL:1909e; 1909g).

Since Frank Palmer was a proud man and had quit dentistry to pursue a career in archaeology, it is doubtful that he took the criticism in this letter well. By November of 1907, Lummis and Palmer had openly argued about the affiliation with the AIA. In an attempt to assuage Palmer's anger, save their friendship and convince Palmer that affiliation with the AIA was beneficial to the society, Lummis wrote a letter to Palmer. In this letter Lummis stated that the, "constitution and by-laws of the Southwest Museum are yet entirely in the air" (Lummis BRL:1907e), meaning that the Southwest Museum had yet to be chartered and may not have been under the purview of the AIA like the Southwest Society was. The essence of this was that Palmer felt that he was losing his control over his professional position as curator for the Southwest Society, and of which he hoped to continue to be for the Southwest Museum, his professionalism in general within the discipline and his influence with the executive committee of the Southwest Society. Needless to say, this letter did little to calm Palmer's anger and fear and the feud expanded into other issues.

4.4 Fieldwork and Gossip

The conduct of fieldwork was also a central component of the emerging concept of professional archaeology. Thus, in 1906 the AIA began to suspect Palmer of conducting faulty archaeological fieldwork for the Southwest Society (Snead 2002:132). The AIA sought to do something about it, Snead (2002:132) noted that "[o]n Kelsey's authority, a representative was dispatched to oversee and evaluate the Southwest Society's second Arizona expedition". This representative was Edgar Lee Hewett.

Hewett was an established archaeologist with powerful connections who became the president of the New Mexico Normal University, located in Las Vegas, Nevada

(Chauvenet 1983:38; Snead 2005:29; Fowler 1999:168). He also ran the Santa Fe Archaeological Society and taught archaeology to students (Chauvenet 1983:40). Hewett also saw Lummis as a man with like-minded goals and ambitions (Chauvenet 1983:41).

Additionally, unlike Palmer, Hewett was a copious note taker on all aspects of his life and of the ruins (Chauvenet 1983:41). Hewett wrote publications and knew William Henry Holmes and Frederick Ward Putnam as well as other influential persons involved in archaeology at the time (Chauvenet 1983:43-44; Fowler 1999:168).

Hewett thus threatened Palmer on two main levels: his presence in Arizona impinged on Palmer's control and autonomy. Secondly, since it seemed that the Southwest Museum would be a separate entity than the Southwest Society, Palmer feared his position as curator at the museum might go to Hewett instead.

These fears were not unfounded. Hewett was a professional challenge to Palmer because of his national presence and his influence with several key societies, including the AIA's President, Francis Willey Kelsey. To add to the already impressive background of Hewett's (See Chauvenet 1983), he was also instrumental in passing the Lacy Bill. Lummis wrote, "[t]he Lacy Bill was written and got through Congress by Dr. Edgar L. Hewett, after a heroic campaign lasting through the years; backed by the prominent scientific bodies of the East" (Lummis BRL:1909c).

Additionally, Palmer's failures as a scientific archaeologist were beginning to attract attention. Snead wrote in reference to Palmer's 1905 museum expeditions at Redondo Beach and in Arizona: "Rumors that the scientific aspects of the 1905 work had been substandard reached Kelsey's ears, and he was concerned that the scholarly reputation of the Institute would suffer" (Snead 2003:80). Hewett's presence at the

second museum-led expedition in Arizona was not just Lummis's idea, but was also approved by the AIA as a way of safeguarding their reputation.

In a letter written by Palmer to the Executive Committee Palmer wrote about Hewett:

I regret exceedingly that Mr. Lummis should have seen fit to make Dr. Hewett a factor to be considered in this discussion- I feel that I am also expressing your own thoughts- More particularly do I deplore the fact that, in an entirely unnecessary fulsomeness of praise, he has sought to magnify the qualifications of Dr. Hewett, by an attempt to belittle your Curator.
[Palmer BRL:1909j]

However, Palmer maintained in the same document that Hewett respected Palmer and that it was Lummis, and not Hewett, who refused to let Palmer have control of the expeditions. Additionally, Palmer was upset that Lummis brought a person from outside of the Southwest Society when he was their appointed curator and saw this as a personal attack on his professionalism by Lummis.

It is prudent to mention that Palmer was wrong on both counts. Not only did the AIA and Lummis prefer Hewett's presence, but also Hewett did not respect Palmer or his 'professionalism'. Snead wrote of Hewett's assessment of Palmer as being subpar and instead wrote to Kelsey, "suggesting instead that the best way to ensure good results was for himself to accompany the team into the field in a supervisory capacity" (Snead 2003:80). Hewett saw an opportunity for his own personal ambitions within the discipline as a whole. Additionally, he found an avid supporter in Lummis who saw him as the appropriate archaeologist. Palmer did not care to be compared to Hewett as an archaeologist by Lummis. Palmer claimed that Lummis had "sought to magnify the qualifications of Dr. Hewett, by an attempt to belittle your curator" (Palmer BRL:1909j).

Palmer was not just angry with Lummis but was angry with Francis Kelsey of the AIA as well. After Kelsey allegedly claimed that Palmer had no formal archaeological training Palmer said, “I am going to prove that this man Kelsey is a low, lying dog” (No Author BRL:1909d). Palmer maintained in the same document that Paul Schumacher trained him, even though Lummis pointed out that Schumacher had passed away and that it could not be verified (No Author BRL:1909d).

Although angry with Kelsey, Palmer was most outraged with Lummis, who he saw as the orchestrating instigator in all matters of Palmer’s non-professionalism. Not only was Palmer angry about the forced oversight of his work by Hewett, he was additionally outraged by the stipulations Lummis sought to impose with re-affiliation with the AIA. In them, Palmer would have to give his reports and research to Frederick Ward Putnam, who was the foremost academic archaeologist and expert on museums from Harvard, for review. He would also have the authenticity of artifacts that were to be chosen to display verified by the AIA, and have his publications be subject to their review and approval.

In this arrangement, Dr. Hewett would be appointed as director of American Archaeology, who would then be Palmer’s superior. Palmer wrote in response, “I have the honor to be the Curator of the South West Museum- I have the right to assume, and do assume that you believe I possess the ability to properly perform the duties pertaining to that office... all of these demands... would be a reflection upon the ability of your Curator” (Palmer BRL:1909i).

Hewett’s friendship with Lummis offended Palmer on another level as well, since Palmer was convinced that Hewett was stealing Lummis’ attention from California

archaeology and the Southwest Museum. Palmer claimed that Hewett and Lummis were conspiring to establish and build the Santa Fe Museum in New Mexico. Palmer wrote, “I have positive evidence (letters written by the said Hewett and the said Lummis), conclusively proving that their promotion of this museum is in direct contravention of specific statements and implied pledges... promoting a rival institution” (Palmer BRL:1909g). Palmer went so far as to claim that Lummis was funneling the finances of the Southwest Society into the Santa Fe Museum as endorsements (Palmer BRL:1909g).

4.5 Mismanagement and the “King” of the Southwest Society

The mismanagement of money was one of the biggest claims that Palmer made against Lummis. Not only did Palmer accuse him of funneling the Society’s funds to the Santa Fe Museum, but he also claimed that Lummis made poor decisions regarding the Southwest Museum’s potential location. Palmer wrote, “The said Lummis by specious argument, fallacious reasoning, and an unwarranted assertion of his personal popularity and ability to raise funds, succeeded in overcoming the conservative judgment of the Executive Committee, and was given a free hand in the matter of the museum site” (Palmer BRL:1909g). Henry E. Huntington, a wealthy man with an interest in the Southwest Society, had offered the Society a location for the museum that was valued at \$200,000 back in 1909 (Palmer BRL:1909g). Palmer asserted that Lummis’ decision to turn down the location and instead pay for a different one had put the Society into severe debt.

Lastly, Palmer was outraged that Lummis received the credit for founding the Southwest Society and the Southwest Museum. In his letter to the Executive Committee of the Southwest Society, Palmer went so far as to claim that Lummis “would make the

Institute “King”, and himself the “King Maker”... It is obvious by the Institute, he is considered the WHOLE THING” (Palmer BRL:1909i). Palmer resented Lummis’s ties to the AIA and the credit that they allocated to him.

In fact, in April of 1909, Lummis wrote a scathing letter in response to Palmer’s assertion at an Executive Committee meeting on April 23, 1909, that he himself wrote to President Roosevelt and received permission for scientific work on reservations and on Federal land. Lummis wrote in response, “This is a fair example of the fantastic impracticability and exaggerated self-consciousness which have been for five years the one bane of this Society” (Lummis BRL:1909c). It is relevant to remember that without Lummis’ friendship with President Roosevelt, the approval for working on Federal and Native American reservation lands would not have been granted.

4.6 Public Controversy

At first the men kept their arguments confined to letters, however, the Executive Committee meeting of April 23, 1909, was the beginning of the out and out arguments between Palmer and Lummis. Both men garnered support from various members, but ultimately their antics proved to be too much for Executive Committee.

The feud erupted into newspapers in June of 1909. The same day that Palmer allegedly released his arguments to the press. He also penned an angry letter to the members of the Southwest Society and the executive committee, condemning Lummis and the Committee itself. Palmer, essentially, aired the Society’s dirty laundry, which gave Lummis the fodder he needed to publicly go on the attack against Palmer. Palmer’s letters did more than just attack Lummis, however, Palmer also criticized the Southwest Society and their involvement with the AIA, lack of recent expeditions and lack of

control of finances, among other things. Not only did Palmer air the Society's dirty laundry, he opened himself up to criticism not only from Lummis, but also from other stakeholders for Southwestern archaeology and the public in general.

Palmer's public letter is dated June 15, 1909 and contains many attacks against Lummis. The document includes arguments against Lummis' "slander" about Palmer and subtitles that say "Santa Fe Museum", "The Museum Site", "Suppresses Official Correspondence" and "Violates History" (Palmer BRL:1909g). In the "Violates History" section, Palmer makes the claim that Lummis purchased the Caballeria Collection for the Southwest Society. The Caballeria Collection was an assemblage of paintings that dated back 150 years (from 1909) and which showed California history. Palmer wrote, "I have positive evidence that the above statement is NOT TRUE. These pictures HAVE NO HISTORIC VALUE" (Palmer BRL:1909g). Palmer even claimed that Father Caballeria, the man who sold the paintings to Lummis, had signed a document claiming that they were probably from Mexico or from Spain and were purchased recently (Palmer BRL:1909g). Needless to say, these attacks were personal and professional against Lummis and were designed validate Palmer's claims that Lummis was a liar and a villain.

Lummis, ever the opportunist, used this publicity to contact as many influential people as possible in order to solicit their opinion on Palmer's work and his dramatic letter to the members of the Society. Hewett was one of the first to respond, saying, "Your patience in dealing with Dr. Palmer, as an employee of the Museum, has been a matter of continual wonder to me. I have known very well of his peculiarities, and would not have avoided being very impatient with them" (Hewett BRL:1909). It is clear from this quote that Hewett shared Lummis's dislike of Palmer and his personality quirks.

Hewett went so far as to claim that he even vouched for Palmer within the discipline throughout the country: “For my own part, I have gone just as far as I possibly could in upholding his work when it has come up for discussion throughout the country, but I cannot follow him with an approving word when he adopts the course that he now has” (Hewett BRL:1909). This brings up two important points: one, that according to Hewett, Palmer and his work and collections have been discussed on a national platform. Secondly, that Palmer dug his own professional grave by going public with his grievances. Indeed, even Francis Kelsey, the President of the AIA, wrote in support of Lummis saying, “Of course you shall come out of it all right, as you always do” (Kelsey BRL:1909).

One of the only major players that did not turn on Palmer after his public outburst was William Henry Holmes, the head of the BAE. Holmes had been an ambivalent support of Palmer. At times, Holmes appeared supportive of Palmer, asking for publications (No Author BRL:1909d). However, by the time of the feud in 1909, Holmes had begun to distance himself from Palmer. Palmer commented on this change in a charged conversation with Lummis in which he said, “I do not know what change has come over Holmes” (No Author BRL:1909d). Although Holmes did not fully betray Palmer in his letter, it is apparent that the two were not on the best of terms during this time.

Most of the persons Lummis contacted returned letters to Lummis in which they had turned on Palmer and his charges. Most of the charges Palmer laid out in his letters that were against Lummis echoed many of Lummis’s issues with Palmer. Palmer claimed that Lummis was “unfit”, mismanaged funds so badly as to make the Society in debt,

changed meeting minutes to reflect his own agenda, that he attempted to control the Executive Committee and that he encourages vandalism of archaeological sites and lacks historical integrity for display purposes. The similarities between the two men's allegations are remarkable: mismanaging funds, lack of ability and controlling and domineering personalities.

Not surprisingly, Palmer's first and second allegations against Lummis were: "1. The said Lummis has sought and still seeks to coerce, intimidate and humiliate F. M. Palmer, curator. 2. He has sought and still seeks to destroy the reputation of the said Palmer as a competent archaeologist and explorer" (Palmer BRL:1909h). The other allegations are against Lummis as stated above.

Two salient points can be gathered from these allegations: that Palmer was primarily concerned with his professional reputation and that he believed Lummis to be the instigator. In order to garner support for his attacks against Lummis, Palmer was forced to find other factors in which to prove that Lummis was untrustworthy. These took the form of Lummis allegedly ransacking archaeological site, which is ironic coming from Palmer, and his purposeful manipulation of artifacts to present a distorted history.

The newspaper articles covering the story are quite scandalous with such titles as "Museum Curator in Tilt with Secretary: Archaeologists Charge Incompetency, Inefficiency and Lack of Scientific Reputation in Exchange of Belligerent Letters" (Los Angeles Herald, June 23, 1909). Or "Hell Popping. Archaeologist Gets Coltish: Kicks and Snorts from Two Famous Explorers" (Los Angeles Times, June 24, 1909). Neither of these titles provided either man with any compliments. In fact, it paints both of them as dramatic and "belligerent". Indeed, as the two brought their feud into the newspaper, the

allegations against one another become more hostile than the ones that they presented to the Southwest Society. Additionally, these newspapers brought their attacks on professionalism, or lack thereof, into a public forum.

Lummis released a statement about Palmer in which he said “His lack of mental balance has been evident for a long time to the committee... If Dr. Palmer had had any courtesy toward his associates or respect for science or loyalty to this community, or anything better than his chronic vanity, it would never have been necessary to prove his lack of standing in the world of science” (Los Angeles Times, “Hell Popping. Archaeology Gets Coltish” June 24, 1909). Not only does Lummis basically call Palmer an insane, selfish and unscientific, he also asserted that Palmer was nothing more than desecrator of Native American graves. In another statement he said, “A collector disemboweling what was once the home of human beings; leaving an ash heap of refuse... neither scientific, nor historic, nor human, nor respectable” (Los Angeles Times, “Hell Popping. Archaeology Gets Coltish” June 24, 1909). Notice how the charges of desecration have now emerged from Lummis after Palmer had just leveled the same charge at him.

Palmer, never one to be outdone, also gave his side to the newspapers. After having failed to garner enough support from the Executive Committee to oust Lummis, Palmer instead made an empathetic plea to the denizens of Los Angeles. He wrote, “I appeal to your sense of justice, and of right, that you compel the said Lummis to prove the truth of his statement, or resign the offices he holds in the Southwest society and in the Southwest museum” (Los Angeles Herald, “Archaeologist Scores Lummis” June 22, 1909).

The problems between the two men had grown immensely since the first 1905 Arizona expedition. By the time Hewett and Lummis had cemented their friendship, the animosity between Lummis and Palmer had become out of control. Not only had the men argued in the Executive Committee meetings, they attempted to pull in as many people as possible for potential allies against the other.

4.7 Arbitration

Mary Emily Foy was just the ally Palmer was looking for. She was a wealthy financial backer of the Southwest Society and a member of the Executive Committee. Born in 1862, Foy was heavily involved with educational and social pursuits such as being involved with the Southwest Society, and was the first female librarian at the Los Angeles Public Library and assisted in the effort for women's suffrage in California (Apostol 1996). She was even given the title of "Miss Los Angeles herself" since she was so involved and influential in the city (Apostol 1996:5).

Joseph Scott was also a member of the executive committee suggested to Foy in a letter that both Lummis and Palmer should lay out their arguments before the committee so that the committee could make an unbiased judgment (Scott BRL:1909a). He suggested that they write out their grievances and present them to the committee. As of July 1909, the Southwest Society appointed a Committee on Arbitration to solve the problems between Lummis and Palmer. During this time, the two men each typed up and presented their arguments against the other man, as discussed earlier. During these proceedings Palmer outlined his plan. Palmer, and presumably the Arbitration Committee, identified the main problems as being the involvement with the AIA, and the relation of the Southwest Society to the not-yet-built Southwest Museum. In a letter to the Executive

committee of the Southwest Society and to the Board of Directors of the Southwest Museum, dated July, 1909, was a copy of “Palmer’s Plan” (Palmer BRL:1909b). In this plan, it claims that a special committee made up of Mary Foy, Joseph Scott, Charles Lummis and Frank Palmer were charged with defining the role and limitations between the Southwest Society and Museum (Palmer BRL:1909b). However, since this is Palmer’s version, it can be assumed that these are his stipulations and not the group as a whole since no one actually signed the document. In the short document, Palmer demands that the Southwest Society be a completely separate organizations and that there be “absolute severance of relations” and “that for the ensuing five years no officer of either organization shall hold office in the other” (Palmer BRL:1909b). However, these stipulations were never agreed on and it was left to the other members to try their different plans.

By September of 1909, Foy was attempting to find a resolution between the two men. She wrote a letter to Lummis on September 13, 1909, in which she stated her solution: that the Southwest Society and the Southwest Museum should be comprised as separate organizations, including separate executive committees and staff. She wrote, “I suggest that you retire from the offices of the Southwest Museum director and Secretary and Dr. Palmer retire from the Southwest Society committee and its Curatorship. This would leave you as chief inspiration of the work of the Southwest Society and Dr. Palmer as chief inspiration of the Southwest Museum” (Foy BRL:1909). This was inspired, at least in part, from the fact that the Southwest Museum (not yet built) had recently established a board of directors, and the Southwest Society has already pledged to do all they could to support and provide for the museum. She sought to bridge some of the

differences between the two men, and to keep the Society associated with the museum. Additionally, Foy included stipulations such as the Southwest Society should continue to pay for the curator's salary until the Southwest Museum could assume that responsibility. She also asked that all collections acquired by the Southwest Society be given to the Southwest Museum. Foy thought that by coming to a compromise, and keeping the men separate from each other, she would solve the problems between the two. However, this was not to be the case (Foy BRL:1909).

Lummis responded the very next day to Foy's letter, September 14, 1909, writing, "I am very sorry that I can not seriously see my way to resign from the Southwest Museum, nor yet from the Southwest Society. It is my impression that I have had something to do with establishing both" (Lummis BRL:1909n). As to Foy's other suggestions and points, Lummis categorically answered pointedly that the Southwest Society's motives and aims were to create and found the Southwest Museum. He also pointed out that he had worked tirelessly for both causes of the Southwest Society and the Southwest Museum without salary and felt that his presence and abilities was instrumental to the survival of both organizations (Lummis BRL:1909n).

Palmer must have sensed a change in the atmosphere within the Executive Committee and the community at large, since, in the undated document called "My Last Word", he outlined his final pleadings to the Executive Committee of the Southwest Society (Palmer BRL:1909d). In it, Palmer reiterates much of his previous arguments: that he is a competent archaeologist that can appropriately conduct fieldwork, that he can organize collections well, that his writing is scientific, that he did not require oversight. Lastly he claimed that he has, "given more thought, effort, and money to this cause, than

any other individual in the West has, or is likely to give- I now hold the position that has been my life desire” (Palmer BRL:1909d).

4.8 The War is Lost

Palmer’s impassioned pleas and Foy’s attempts to assist him proved to be futile. In the end, the remaining members of the Executive Committee who were also on the board of arbitration, J. O. Koepfli, Joseph Scott, Adna R. Chaffee, W.C. Patteron and M. Newmark, made the final decision (Los Angeles Times, “Feud Settled by Heavy Men” October 6, 1909). The arbitration board wrote that they found Lummis to be “indispensable” and that Palmer’s “conduct as Curator to be subject to censure” (Koepfli et. al. BRL:1909). Lastly, they wrote, “we regret all the more that we feel compelled to recommend to both organizations that Dr. Palmer be requested to tender his resignation immediately” (Koepfli et. al. BRL:1909). They also asked that a negotiation with Palmer be worked out after his resignation where he catalogues his collections, a task they felt he should have completed already.

Lummis did more than just gain support and control over the Executive Committee. Snead (2001:91) pointed out that “[h]e eventually defeated his opponents and forced Palmer and Foy to resign”. Thus, Lummis not only eliminated Palmer, but also other threats to his power on the Board.

Palmer resigned October 27, 1909 (Palmer BRL:1909e). In December of the same year, Palmer wrote a letter to the new curator of the Southwest Museum, Dr. Hector Alliot in regards to Palmer cataloguing the collection for a sum (Palmer BRL:1909a). Alliot took on Palmer’s duties as curator almost instantaneously, and was most certainly the first curator inside the actual Southwest Museum, which opened in 1914. The Southwest

Society had asked Palmer to come up with a monetary amount for him to catalogue the Southwest's collections (No Author BRL:1909e.). The entire value of this proposition lay in the fact that the Society's Executive Committee thought that Palmer could provide details on what the artifacts were, and where they were collected from.

Palmer responded by addressing his letter directly to Alliot instead of the Executive Committee itself. In his letter, he claimed to have intimate knowledge of most of the collections. He wrote, "I will state that, with exception of less than three hundred specimens, the Museum collections are either the direct result of my personal researches or were purchased on my recommendation" (Palmer BRL:1909a). He gave three estimates of the cost for him to catalogue the collections, of which he implored the Executive Committee to decide quickly since he had other employment opportunities.

The response penned by the Executive Committee to Palmer sums up the three cost estimate choices Palmer offers them: "This reply indicates that you would be willing to catalogue these collections fully for \$2500; partially for \$2,000 and a list without comment for \$1500" (No Author BRL:1909e). In Palmer's letter, he also stated that just to number the specimens was a \$500 minimum job. The collections he intended to catalogue were the Palmer-Campbell collection, the Rutter collection, the Chappelle collection, the Bowers collection, the Doney collection and the Navajo silver and Mexican jade collections (Palmer BRL:1909a).

In short, these estimates enraged the Southwest Society Executive Committee. They wrote in response:

According to the record, you have received in salary some \$5300 as Curator for these collections... The first duty of a Curator is to curate. That means to take care of. The first way to take care of collections is to identify them and catalogue them... It is the unanimous judgment of this

Board, as it was of the special Arbitration Committee, that your refusal to catalogue these specimens in return for the salary so long enjoyed by you, was an unworthy and improper act... we feel that your position is absolutely untenable, and discernible, and savors of scientific blackmail... we will be willing to remunerate you with a sum of \$100. [No Author BRL:1909e]

They also required that Palmer work with Alliot who they claimed had been working on fixing and improving the collection (No Author BRL:1909e). A few days after sending this letter, and not receiving a reply, the Executive Committee changed the sum they would be willing to give to Palmer to \$150. There was no response recorded from Palmer. Since the first catalogue produced was by F.C. Luck in 1919, it is safe to say that Palmer did not take the Executive Committee up on their offer.

Chapter 5: The Collection

5.1 The Palmer Southern California Archaeology Collection

The Southwest Museum opened its doors in 1914 after many years of struggle for the Southwest Society Board of Directors and Charles Lummis. The newly built building in what is now the Mount Washington neighborhood in Los Angeles, boasts a panoramic view of the surrounding cities, and large exhibition halls.

The Palmer collection from the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce made its way into the Southwest Museum in 1915 and was incorporated with the Palmer-Campbell collection, to be called the Palmer collection. These artifacts represented the core of the museum's archaeological materials. In the changing environment of the new institution, however, their situation was uncertain.

5.2 Summary of the Cataloguing Process from May to August 2014

As part of the research conducted at the museum, and within its' associated library, the Braun, from May to late August in 2014, the artifacts from the Palmer collection were systematically catalogued by location, material type, context and object descriptions, if known for all. The 1919 F.C. Luck catalogue, was used as a cross-referencing tool in order to deduce as much information about the above-mentioned categories, but particularly for location and context.

According to Luck's inventory, there should be 907 artifacts in the Palmer collection, acquired from San Diego, San Bernardino, Los Angeles, Ventura, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo, San Clemente Island, Catalina Island, San Nicolas Island, Santa Rosa Island, Santa Cruz Island and San Miguel Island. The artifacts were also collected from either surface finds, grave finds or shell mound finds. It is difficult, if not

impossible, to be more exact for either the locations or the contexts in which these artifacts were collected.

Finding the Palmer artifacts within the museum itself was a difficult task. Some were just labeled 2.P. but do not have a following number or any other identifying information. However, with the help of the Southwest Museum staff, many Palmer artifacts were located. As Table 2 shows, only 335 of the original 907 objects in the collection were accounted for after the research and cataloguing had been concluded in late August of 2014. If there were multiple objects or pieces in the same catalogue number, such as shell beads, they were catalogued as one object. Please see Appendix A for the August 2014 catalogue.

Table 2: Collection Location and Context

Location	Grave	Shell Mound	Surface	NA	Total
Santa Rosa	39	5	32	1	77
San Luis Obispo	24	1	3	8	36
San Miguel	7				7
Santa Barbara	21			24	45
Catalina	22	1		9	32
San Clemente	1	1			2
Los Angeles	8	8	16	34	66
Ventura	3			5	8
Santa Cruz	9	1		11	21
Redondo Beach				37	37
No Location				4	4
Totals	134	17	51	98	335

Of the 335 objects catalogued, 134 artifacts, or 40% of the remaining collection, were found in grave or burial contexts. This is not particularly shocking for the time period. It was common practice of Stephen Bowers and other early artifact collectors.

That is because, as Benson (1997:19) pointed out, “the collection of unique museum pieces was their primary objective, these early archaeologists concentrated on excavating cemeteries”. Therefore, many of the objects are catalogued as coming from a grave.

It is therefore no surprise that Palmer wrote frequently that he exploited graves and cemeteries in casual tones: “It is conceded by careful observation that objects of this character taken from the ancient village-sites and cemeteries of the Southern California Indians, in excellence of workmanship, size and symmetry of form, are unequaled” (Palmer BRL:1907b). Palmer frequently praised the Native Americans of southern California for the quality of their artifacts and made it a point to collect as many unique artifacts as possible from their graves (Palmer BRL:1917).

Palmer’s actions and archaeological practices were not uncommon for early archaeologists. However, past practices are judged with an ethnocentric view. McVicker claimed that “it is ironic that anthropologists, who are the first to teach that cultures must be judged in their own terms, are often the first to condemn the careers of their predecessors out of historical context” (McVicker 1989:114). By understanding that these early collectors were out to find unique and intact objects for museums, it is understandable that they viewed grave goods as a resource.

Indeed, finding “unbroken” artifacts was a primary goal for these men. It is therefore unsurprising that out of the 335 objects identified and catalogued, there was a remarkable amount of objects that are still intact. Table 3 below shows the artifacts that were identified during the summer 2014 inventory process as fragmented or damaged. In fact, only 12 out of the 335, which is roughly 3.5% of the remaining collection, were noted to have damage extensive enough to document. Additionally, the notes imply that

even though these objects are damaged or fragmented, most of them have had attempted repairs. Additionally, for some objects the damage is unknown, because of the uniqueness of the object, and could potentially be intact.

Table 3: Objects Catalogued as Fragmented or Damaged

Acquisition Number	Location	Extent of Fragment/Damaged?	Artifact Type	Notes
?	Unknown	Very small fragment	Small shell bead fragment	Could have been chipped off from a necklace
2.P.21	LA County	One end broken off	Bone fragment, possible needle or awl	Broken, one end has a perforation
2.P.69	Santa Rosa Island	Damage along outer edges	Bone fragment, possible needle or awl	Fragment of thinned bone with incised designs on one side.
2.P.100	San Luis Obispo	Missing part of hilt design	A fragment of a sword hilt	Metal, historic
2.P.183	San Miguel Island	Unsure of extent of damage, appears mostly intact	Charm Stone	Quartz
2.P.310	Santa Rosa Island	Minimal damage along outer edges	Abalone shell bead or pendant	A rough circle, 24 perforations along outer edges, some broken.
2.P.485	Santa Cruz Island	Was glued back together; two pieces now but both accounted for	Crescent	Broken in half, evidence of attempted repair
2.P.615	Catalina	Unsure of extent of damage, appears mostly intact	Stone object	Flat groundstone object; possible camal fragment.
2.P.661	Santa Rosa Island	Missing entire upper half	Pipe	Pipe base; broken
2.P.689	LA County	Unsure of extent of damage, appears to be missing half of it	Stone object	Possible fragment of arrow straightener
2.P.717	San Luis Obispo	Broken in half, however, both halves accounted for	Pestle	Broken in half. Evidence of hammering on both ends.
2.P.856	Redondo Beach	Broken in half, however, both halves accounted for	Stone Spike	Broken in half, 8" in length
2.P.858	Redondo Beach	Damaged, but still intact	Stone Spike	6" in length.

This table implies that Palmer collected primarily unbroken artifacts. It also shows that the museum personnel over the past one hundred years have kept the intact artifacts. Again, this is not surprising given the common practices of other notable early Californian archaeologists. Benson wrote, “[u]nattractive or damaged artifacts were either thrown back into the excavation or left on the surface” (Benson 1997:18). Frank Palmer most likely participated in this practice as well.

Despite the ambiguity of their points of origin, what is common among all the artifacts is the state of completion that they are in, even over a hundred years later. As Pearce claims, “‘Choice’ is at the heart of the collecting process; a word which expresses its special dual nature as selection and as the allotment of value, whatever form this value may take” (Pearce 1995:27). As can be evidenced in the catalogue (Appendix A), the artifacts collected by Palmer are mostly whole and intact.

Additionally, Palmer did not collect any debitage or by-products of the production process of stone tools, nor were many of the tools he collected retouched. In fact, there are a great many of decorative items that Palmer collected from all the locations listed, such as dress ornaments, necklaces, pendants, charms and others. There are also effigies and pelican stones, but very few manos (7 in total). This implies that Palmer sought ‘museum-grade’ objects that were intact and were more decorative than utilitarian for the museum collections.

The types of artifacts found during the 2014 cataloguing are notable as well. Table 4 shows the distribution of the types of artifacts recovered. Notable artifact types that appeared numerous times were further subdivided in the table. The ‘Generic Tools’ subheading includes known tool types such as pestles, stone spikes, manos,

hammerstones and comals. If the artifact function is not firmly established, such as a pelican stone, or if the use could only marginally be considered a tool, such as a whistle, then it was put into the 'Other' category at the end of the table. Beads, pendants, decorative shell buttons and ornaments were often interchangeable and were assigned their own category.

Table 4	Artifacts Types								
	Tools				Decorative/Symbolic			Other	
	Generic tools	Shell, bone and stone Fishhook	Projectile Point	Crescent	Necklace	Pendants/Buttons/ beads/ornaments	Effigies/charm s	Bowl/Dish	Other
Total of each	82	8	100	21	17	75	5	3	24
Total in Categ ory	211				97			27	

What is particularly interesting is that out of the known locations that Palmer collected from, San Diego, San Bernardino and San Nicolas Island were not identified in this assemblage. About 11% of the remaining assemblage came from Redondo Beach. This was gleaned from a note in F.C. Luck's catalogue indicating that these were additions from Redondo Beach from 1903. However, it is not known how Luck knew where the artifacts originated since many of the records and correspondence from Palmer are now lost, or perhaps never were created in the first place.

It appears that Palmer did not keep field or collection notes. This is a point of departure from Reverend Bowers and other notable collectors in the region. Benson (1997:20) says of Bowers, Schumacher, Taylor and others that, while they "did not employ standard field techniques, they were all aware of the importance of keeping field notes". Palmer was clearly an exception to this practice. To add to the loss of information about the collection, Palmer never created a catalogue. One can only hope that over time more information regarding the origins and subsequent activities to the collection can be uncovered.

5.3 Redondo Beach

Redondo Beach, known colloquially as the Palmer-Redondo site, is the only specifically known California site where Palmer collected. The rest of the localities mentioned were counties, islands or cities where Palmer collected or purchased artifacts from. The modern site designation for this Redondo Beach site is CA-LAN-127. It is known. In 1906 Palmer wrote a report called "Reports on Researches Conducted by the Southwest Society of the Archaeological Institute of America" in which he described the

work done at the site in 1905. The site included a village and a quarry as well as a nearby cemetery. Later, in 1931, archaeologist Richard Van Valkenburgh wrote that Palmer found the site in 1878, which is contradictory to Palmer's assertion that he discovered it in 1876 (Van Valkenburgh BRL:1930). However, a difference of two years is not a large one, especially since Van Valkenburgh's notes were written over 50 years after the discovery of the site and are therefore removed from the actual time period.

Additionally, Van Valkenburgh wrote that from the first collection from the site, 20% went to the "Peahooty fam." [most likely Peabody Museum?]; that of the second collection 20% went to the "Field Museum"; that the whole of the third collection went to the "Redondo High School"; and that of the fourth collection, 25% went to the "Southwest Museum" (Van Valkenburgh BRL:1930). The accuracy of this is also up for debate. Van Valkenburgh does not discuss the dates of these collecting enterprises nor does he explain where the remaining 35% of the collections went.

However, after conducting some research on the online database for the Peabody Museum in Harvard, it was found that two objects are definitely from Frank Palmer. The object numbers are 94-57-10/R587 and 94-57-10/R585. Interestingly, the object records list Frederick H. Rindge as the donator and Frank Palmer as the collector. It also claims that these objects were donated in 1894, prior to the dates Van Valkenburgh suggests. The objects are two steatite stone dishes, one about 8 inches across and round, and the other much more narrow at about 5 inches in length and one inch wide. The Peabody also has these objects as being listed as Klamath, or the Klamath River, which is located in Northern California and Southern Oregon. Whatever the mystery of their origins, it is still valuable to know that Frank Palmer artifacts can be found in another notable institutions.

In Palmer's 1905 report from Redondo Beach he wrote that, "[t]he investigation of this ancient quarry resulted in a fine collection of wrought and unwrought nodules, flakes, and chips, and thirty-three stone hammers" (Palmer BRL:1906b). These are clearly not represented in the current museum catalogue of artifacts that were collected for the Palmer collection or for the 1905 Redondo Beach expedition.

The question is, were these stone artifacts lost by mislabeling, or misidentification over the years? Were they traded, gifted, used for educational or display purposes and subsequently lost track of? Where are the remaining 572 artifacts from the F.C. Luck catalogue?

5.4 Trade and Possible Ways the Artifact Information Was Lost

It is possible that some of these artifacts were mislabeled, were sent to other institutions or that the catalogue numbers had simply fallen off. They may also have been mishandled, or destroyed. Additionally the possibility of trade among enthusiasts must be considered. Such exchanges were a well-known practice during the early development of the archaeological and anthropological discipline from the mid 1800s through the early 1900s. For example, the Smithsonian Institution created a reserve series and a duplicate series of artifacts that it received (Nichols 2014:226). The reserve artifacts were to be kept for the museum itself for display or for educational purposes while the duplicate series was sent to other institutions or collectors. Nichols wrote, "From 1882 to 1920, curators sent approximately 750 collections of anthropological material in exchange from the Smithsonian Institution to private collectors, European and colonial museums, domestic educational establishments, and museum-based anthropologists" (Nichols 2014:227). Since the BAE was the most respected anthropological authoritative body

within the United States at the time, many museums would have sought to participate in the exchange process.

Dr. Palmer was more than likely a willing and enthusiastic participant with this, since he was also a friend of William Henry Holmes, the head of the BAE. In fact, in a letter from Holmes to Lummis, Holmes wrote, “Since no single institution undertaking explorations can hope to cover more than a small fraction of the best area to be explored, it is suggested that a liberal policy of exchange be adopted by those conducting explorations” (Holmes BRL:1905). It is not conclusively known if the Society exchanged with the Smithsonian or not, but, the evidence indicates that such exchanges probably took place. It is clear that Lummis agreed with Holmes assertion in the letter (Holmes BRL:1905). Thus, as Nichols (2014:227) pointed out, “[t]hrough the exchange, objects moved between museums to serve the dual purpose of diversifying each collection and providing authenticated specimens for research”.

It is also prudent to point out that Lummis may have sent Edgar Lee Hewett artifacts at his museum and field school in New Mexico. Hewett and Lummis remained friends and professional alliances years after the Palmer affair. Lummis even went on Hewett’s 1911 expedition to Guatemala (Chauvenet 1983:86).

The exchange of artifacts during this time also highlights the fact that museums, collectors, educational centers and the like, were not lone islands, but rather contributed to the larger exchange of knowledge and research. Objects moved much further than the United States as well, and were often sent to Europe as evidence of our country’s wonderful and rich history (Nichols 2014).

The exchange of artifacts by Palmer also provides an explanation for the missing whereabouts of at least a few of the artifacts unaccounted for in the 2.P. collection, if not more. Another possibility is that the artifacts may have been damaged and then discarded. This is because, as Nichols (2014:234) pointed out, “nineteenth-century Smithsonian curators often prioritized their aims regarding scientific research and education over blanket notions of preservation”. Since preservation was not a main goal of these early institutions, it is not surprising that many artifacts from a collection over 100 years old are now lost.

5.5 Discussion

Whatever the fate of the missing artifacts, the Palmer collection is still a valuable resource for researching the history of the archeological discipline within California. The catalogues and records can still provide information about the location and context that they were collected from. Reconstructing as much of the provenience and provenance as possible can make these objects useful for future researchers or can aid in repatriation efforts.

Additionally, these artifacts feature centrally in the interactions that took place around Palmer. Without these collections, Palmer never could have secured his position as curator for the Southwest Society. These contentious social interactions also affected the collection. The full extent of how the feud affected the Palmer Collection will mostly likely never be known. However, it can be suggested that without Palmer’s influence, and with his reputation in tatters, the usefulness of his collection had lessened for Charles Lummis and the Southwest Society.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

6.1 Politics and Collecting Practices

Today Charles Lummis is considered the founder of the Southwest Museum. Dudley Gordon wrote of Lummis, “Because of his imagination and energy, the region can boast of the Southwest Museum, the special collections at the Los Angeles Public Library... and his rock and adobe home, El Alisal, which has become a state historical monument” (Gordon 1959:306). This is in stark contrast to the legacy of Frank Palmer, who is remembered for little besides serving as the museum’s first curator. Even his death certificate could not be found.

Lummis emerged as the authority in his contentious arguments with Palmer. However, it was not because he had more formal education on Native Americans, archaeology or museums than Palmer. Snead wrote that, “the criterion was not yet formal education, but access to the emergent networks of patrons, administrators, and scientists” (Snead 2003:58). Lummis certainly had a wider network of influential people, as is evident by the letters he sent and received on the Palmer controversy, and his influence and ability to grow the Southwest Society so quickly.

As Snead (2003:25) pointed out, this was “a time when institutional competition was on the rise, [and] archaeological and ethnological collections were seen as a source of prestige”. The Palmer collections began as a source of status as founding collections for the Southwest Society that garnered publicity and attention from both within and outside of the field. Palmer used his collection as a means to gain an authoritative role within the Southwest Society. After Palmer’s fall from grace, from within the Southwest Society and within the discipline itself, the collection fell to obscurity. It is now

fragmented, only partially catalogued and very rarely is an artifact from the collection displayed.

What is left of the collections speaks volumes about several of its previous contexts. Based on the rarity of the objects and their overall condition of being intact, even 150 years after they were collected, shows that Palmer sought rare and complete artifacts. Additionally, it indicates that throughout the past 100 years the museum professionals cared for and retained the information for only 37% of the Palmer collection.

6.2 Commodities and Control

Appadurai and Kopytoff assert that artifacts are commodities in which their value is determined by the social circumstances (Appadurai 1986; Kopytoff 1986). This concept is integral to understanding the meaning these artifacts have in a specific point in time, and how their meaning and value changes. Since commodities and their production and uses are tied to capitalist ideology, it follows that those in control are the ones that determine what is valuable and what is not. Lummis was the winner of the feud and thus he would be in power of the situation of determining the value of Palmer's collection. Appadurai wrote, "[i]t is in the interest of those in power to completely freeze the flow of commodities, by creating a closed universe of commodities and a rigid set of regulations about how they are to move" (Appadurai 1986:57). Thus, by destroying Palmer's professional reputation as an archaeologist, Lummis helped to create a framework in which the museum would have to employ persons that met his criteria. Lummis effectively created a closed system in which the artifacts could move. It is doubtful that

without Palmer's presence and influence that the Palmer collection would continue to be flaunted in publications by Lummis.

Palmer's lack of professionalism was made public by the feud with Lummis. Notable persons in positions of authority, such as Francis Kelsey, Edgar Lee Hewett and Frederick Ward Putnam, would hear of Palmer's failures by late 1909. The sensationalism of the feud combined with widespread rumors about Palmer would serve to exclude him from the discipline. The circumstances surrounding the founding of the Southwest Museum set the precedent and the tone for early museum professionalization in Los Angeles. And since Los Angeles has since become a major metropolitan city in the United States, and the world at large, these initial interactions and events have lasting effects.

Additionally, collections, which are representations of the cultural value of when they were accumulated, also have lasting effects. Pearce wrote, "[c]ollections help to create social action, and so 'old' collecting, accumulated in the past, continues to affect us through the continuing successions of presents" (Pearce 1995:283). Each successive generation has placed their value on these old collections, and what remains is representative of what continues to be valued.

These value judgments and actions for or against the preservation, display or educational use of these artifacts were part of complex interactions between people and the artifacts. These actions are essentially political, which fuels different agendas. Lummis used the politics of the Southwest Society and the feud to fuel his personal mission and fulfill his vendetta against Palmer. Appadurai wrote, "*Politics* (in the broad sense of relations, assumptions, and contests pertaining to power) is what links value and

exchange in the social life of commodities” (Appadurai 1986:57). With this definition, it is easy to view that by Lummis gaining control over the Southwest Society and by outing Palmer entirely, emerged as the winner in this situation. Therefore, although Palmer chose the artifacts and amassed the collection, thus creating a reflection of his personal perceptions on what is valuable, the artifacts passed into another social context after his fall from grace. A context that was controlled by Lummis.

In the post-Palmer days, the collection was rarely mentioned in newspapers and was no longer featured in the *Out West* publications. There was a difference in how Lummis and Palmer valued the Palmer collection. Appadurai (1986:57) claims “the fact that not all parties share the same interests in any specific regime of value, nor are the interests of any two parties in a given exchange identical”. Although Lummis valued these artifacts, he did not value them in the same way as Palmer. If anything, the most likely scenario is that Lummis’ value of the Palmer collection depreciated greatly after his altercations with him. And because Lummis was behind the founding and operations of the Southwest Museum, it follows that he chose not advertise, display or otherwise promote the collection.

6.3 The Next Phase of an Old Collection’s Social Life

Even though the collection is not as complete as it was one hundred years ago, it has entered a new phase in its social life (Kopytoff 1986). The reawaked interest in it, as evident from this thesis, is one such benefit of working with old and fragmented collections such as the Palmer one. It has inspired research on the history of archaeology and collecting in Los Angeles and on the rise of professionalism in the region.

Its story continues throughout the generations to present day, where it is once again reassembled and has received attention from researchers. By uniting the existing catalogues and with extra research into their provenance, these artifacts can be available to researchers interested in the various aspects of California prehistory and historic interactions. Additionally, the research provides an opportunity for repatriation, since many of the artifacts were taken from grave contexts.

Lastly, the story of Frank Palmer and his collection is a case study that looks at the professionalization of the American archaeological discipline in Los Angeles. The story highlights the importance of personal interactions and individuals. It also explores the interplay of how the social circumstances and the collections affect each other.

The potential that archaeological collections in museums for research is phenomenal for comparative studies as well as for re-examining with increasing access and availability of technological advances. The importance of properly curating an archaeological collection is paramount. Marquardy et. al. wrote, “[s]uch collections represent a valuable resource only if they are properly documented, conserved, and organized in such a manner that their research value is maintained” (Marquardy et. al. 1982:409). A collection, and artifacts in general, lose their research potential when they are divorced from these contexts. However, with the initial attempts of unifying the artifacts into a singular collection again and by researching their provenance and provenience, what remains of the collection can better be used as a resource for the academic community and for the museum itself. The artifacts can be used as research tools for archaeologists and historians as well as be displayed or re-examined since, over time, available technology for artifact analysis has changed.

There is still research potential in many of the semi-curated archaeological collections, such as the Frank Palmer collections. It can be a daunting task, however, to wade through mounds of paper in an archive in search of information about the collection or to rummage through boxes of seemingly disassociated artifacts in order to put the objects back together with their original collection context. However, the work is valuable and can provide insight into the history of the collection, the collectors, the era in which it was collected as well as potential for comparative study and analysis with new technology and research goals.

Additionally, the political situation surrounding the success or failure of an individual, institution, or even the artifacts visibility within the public and professional discipline, directly impacts these endeavors, as is evident with the story of Frank Palmer and his once famous collections. The human aspect of archaeology collections, in the collecting, display and preservation aspects, can alter or ensure their use as commodities within their social sphere. The demand for cohesive collections with established provenience is still prevalent within the archaeological discipline in the United States. Further research into these seemingly dead-end collections can once again make them useful and available for these purposes.

Also, the arguments that these two men brought to the attention of the archaeological community and the public of Los Angeles, could very well have changed the way archaeologists and other professionals within the anthropological discipline viewed these issues. Due to Lummis' winning of the feud, and his close association with Hewett and other notable persons in the field at the time, his arguments against Palmer's lack of professionalism was heard on a national scale. The professionalizing of the

discipline was occurring on a national level where amateurs were being excluded from the professional discourse. This case study shows that similar circumstances were occurring in Los Angeles in the early 1900s as well.

The circumstances around the Frank Palmer archaeology collections from 1890 to 1909 provide a great case study in the history of Los Angeles museums and archaeology. The struggle between professionals and amateurs during the time are highlighted by Frank Palmer's story. This research proves that these forgotten and old collections still have valuable stories left to tell.

Abbreviations for Archives

BRL Braun Research Library Collection from *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*,
Autry National Center, Los Angeles California.

References

Allen, Susan Heuck

2002a The Archaeology of the AIA: An Introduction. *In* Excavating our Past: Perspectives on the History of the Archaeological Institute of America. Susan Heuck Allen, ed. Pp. 1-28. Boston: Archaeological Institute of American.

2002b “Americans in the East”: Francis Henry Bacon, Joseph Thatcher Clarke, and the AIA at Assos. *In* Excavating our Past: Perspectives on the History of the Archaeological Institute of America. Susan Heuck Allen, ed. Pp. 63-92. Boston: Archaeological Institute of American.

Appadurai, Arjun

1986 Introduction: Commodities and the Politics of Value. *In* The Social Life of Things Commodities in Cultural Perspective. Arjun Appadurai, ed. Pp. 3-63. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Apostol, Jane

1996 Mary Emily Foy: “Miss Los Angeles Herself”. *Southern California Quarterly* V. LXXVII(2).

Balfour, Henry

2004 [1909] Presidential Address to the Museums Association, Maidstone Meeting, 1909. *In* Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Pp. 252-259. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Barnhart, Terry A.

2005 Ephraim George Squire and the Development of American Anthropology. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Bazin, Germain

2004 [1967] From the Museum Age Forward. *In* Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Pp. 18-22. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Benson, Arlene

1997 The Noontide Sun: The Field Journals of the Reverend Stephen Bowers, Pioneer California Archaeologist. Novato: Ballena Press.

Boas, Franz

2004 [1887] Museums of Ethnological Museums. *In* Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Pp. 139-142. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Broun, Elizabeth

2004 [1999] Telling the Story of America. *In* Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Pp. 296-301. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Butler, Kathleen L. and M. Steven Shackley

2002 Sites of Discovery: Art and Archaeology in 19th Century Photographs of the American Southwest. Ed. William E. Brown Jr. Bancroft Library: Regents of the University of California.

Caballeria, Juan

1909 "I spent many years in purchasing and collecting". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [3 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate] [7/2/1909].

Campbell, Wilbur Dudley

1892 "Friend Lummis, I presume congratulations and sympathy are in order". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.1.1.654] [7/26/1892].

No Date "My dear Lummis, Your letter rvc'd! Thank you for same." *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.1.1.654] [10/26/no year].

Chaffee, Adna R.

1909 "Your communication addressed to Mr. Hector Alliot has been presented". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.1.1.3439F] [12/10/1909].

Chauvenet, Beatrice

1983 Hewett and Friends: A Biography of Santa Fe's Vibrant Era. Santa Fe: Museum of New Mexico Press.

Coggins, Clemency

2002 The Great Divides: The AIA and Professional Responsibility in Archaeology. *In* Excavating our Past: Perspectives on the History of the Archaeological Institute of America. Susan Heuck Allen, ed. Pp. 169-188. Boston: Archaeological Institute of American.

Colwell-Chanthaphonh, Chip

2004 Those Obscure Objects of Desire: Collecting Cultures and the Archaeological Landscape in the San Pedro Valley of Arizona. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*. 33(5):571-599.

Coombes, Annie E.

2004 [1988] Museums and the Formation of National and Cultural Identities. *In* Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Pp. 231-246. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Crane, Susan A.

2004 [1999] Memory, Distortion, and History in the Museum. *In* Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Pp. 318-334. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Davenport, William H.

1986 Two Kinds of Value in the Eastern Solomon Islands. *In* The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective. Arjun Appadurai, ed. Pp. 95-109. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dyson, Stephen L.

1989 The Role of Ideology and Institutions in Shaping Classical Archaeology in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries. *In* Tracing Archaeology's Past: The Historiography of Archaeology. Andrew L. Christianson ed. Pp. 127-135. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

1999 Brahmins and Bureaucrats: Some Reflections on the History of American Classical Archaeology. *In* Assembling the Past: Studies in the Professionalization of Archaeology. Alice B. Kehoe and Mary Beth Emmerichs, eds. Pp. 103-120. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Findlen, Paula

2004 [1989] The Museum: Its Classical Etymology and Renaissance Genealogy. *In* Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Pp. 23-50. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Fowler, Don D.

1999 Harvard vs. Hewett: The Contest for Control of Southwestern Archaeology, 1904-1930. *In* Assembling the Past: Studies in the Professionalization of Archaeology. Alice B. Kehoe and Mary Beth Emmerichs, eds. Pp. 165-212. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

2005 The Formative Years: Southwest Archaeology 1890-1910. *In* Southwest Archaeology of the Twentieth Century. Linda S. Cordell and Don D. Fowler, eds. PP. 16-26. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Foy, Mary E.

1909 "My dear Mr. Lummis: I am enclosing a copy of my thoughts on a possible solution of the problems". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [4 of 4] [Palmer Dispute-1909] [9/13/1909].

Foy, Mary E. and Frank M. Palmer

1909 "Your committee appointed to consider the matter". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [1 of 4] [Palmer Dispute][2/19/1909].

Gell, Alfred

1986 Newcomers to the World of Goods: Consumption among the Muria Gonds. *In* The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective. Arjun Appadurai, ed. Pp. 110-138. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gladwin, Harold S.

4/21/1926 (maybe 1916?) "Mr. Frank. L. Palmer... I am very sorry to trouble you". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [F.M. Palmer Collection].

Goldstein, Daniel

1994 "Yours for Science": The Smithsonian Institution's Correspondents and the shape of Scientific Community in Nineteenth-Century America. *Isis*. 85(4):573-599.

Goldwater, Robert

2004 [1986] The Development of Ethnological Museums. *In* Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Pp. 133-138. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Gordon, Dudley

1959 Charles Fletcher Lummis, Cultural Pioneer of the Southwest. *Arizona and the West* 1(4):305-316.

De Grummond, Nancy Thomson

2002 The Spirit of the Times: 19th Century European Intellectualism. *In* Excavating our Past: Perspectives on the History of the Archaeological Institute of America. Susan Heuck Allen, ed. Pp. 29-48. Boston: Archaeological Institute of American.

Hewett, Edgar L.

1907 "My dear Lummis: None of the plans proposed proved acceptable to the Ex. Com.". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [F.M. Palmer Collection][4/12/1907].

1909 "My dear Mr. Lummis: I have just read in the Los Angeles papers". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][7/19/1909].

Hinsley, Curtis M.

1981 *The Smithsonian and the American Indian: Making a Moral Anthropology in Victorian America*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

1989 *Revising and Revisioning the History of Archaeology: Reflections on Region and Context*. In *Tracing Archaeology's Past: The Historiography of Archaeology*. Andrew L. Christianson ed. Pp.79-96. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Hodge, Frederick W.

1909 "My dear Lummis: A few days ago I received Dr. Palmer's printed screed". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][7/6/1909].

Holmes, William Henry

1905 "My Dear Mr. Lummis: This morning one of the clerks" *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; MS.2, [Box 21] [F.M. Palmer Collection][9/5/1905].

1906a "My dear Doctor Palmer: I am very pleased to have your letter". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [F.M. Palmer Collection][7/23/1906].

1906b "My dear Dr. Palmer: I have your recent communication transmitting data". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [Palmer Manuscripts][12/29/1906].

1907 "My dear Doctor Palmer: I have your letter of September 4th and the accompanying manuscript". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [Palmer Manuscript Collection][9/12/1907].

1909 "Dear Sir: On returning from South America I find on my desk your letter". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [4 of 4] [Palmer Dispute-1909][2/25/1909].

Hrdlicka, A.

1909 "My dear Lummis: I regret the difficulties of which your letter". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [2 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][7/13/1909].

Hudson, Kenneth

2004 [1998] The Museum Refuses to Stand Still. *In* Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Pp. 85-91. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Hughes, West

1909 "My dear Lummis: I have received your report to the members". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [2 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][7/2/1909].

Jacknis, Ira

2002 The First Boasian: Alfred Kroeber and Franz Boas 1896-1905. *American Anthropologist* 104(2):520-532.

Jeter, Marvin D.

1989 Methods of Relating Historical Collections of Artifacts and Associated Records to Known Sites and Current Research. *In* Tracing Archaeology's Past: The Historiography of Archaeology. Andrew L. Christianson ed. Pp.169-179. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Judd, Neil M.

1967 The Bureau of American Ethnology: A Partial History. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Kakaliouas, Ann M. and Joanna Radin

2014 Archiving *Anthropos*: Tracking the Ethics of Collections across History and Anthropology. *Curator: The Museum Journal* 57(2):147-151.

Kakaliouras, Ann M.

2014 When Remains are "Lost": Thoughts on Collections, Repatriation, and Research in American Physical Anthropology. *Curator: The Museum Journal* 57(2):213-223.

Kehoe, Alice B., ed.

1999 Introduction, Multiple Paths. *In* Assembling the Past: Studies in the Professionalization of Archaeology. Alice B. Kehoe and Mary Beth Emmerichs, eds. Pp. 1-24. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Kelly, John E.

2002 Developments in the Career of a Nineteenth Century German-American Archaeologist. *In* New Perspectives on the Origins of Americanist Archaeology, David L. Browman and Stephen Williams eds. Pp. 117-132. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.

Kelsey, Francis W.

1909 "My dear Lummis: I duly received your kind letter with a copy". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [2 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][7/15/1909].

Koepfli, J.O., Joseph Scott, Adna R. Chaffee, W.C. Patterson, and M.N. Newmark.

1909 "The twelfth charge, being the one presented by Dr. Palmer, does nor,". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [4 of 4] [Palmer Dispute-1909][1909].

Kopytoff, Igor

1986 The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process. *In* The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective. Arjun Appadurai, ed. Pp. 64-91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leone, Mark P. and Barbara J. Little

2004 [1993] Artifacts as Expressions of Society and Culture: Subversive Genealogy and the Value of History. *In* Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Pp. 362-374. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Leupp, Francis E.

1905 "Department of the Interior, Office Commissioner of Indian Affairs" *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; MS.2, [Box 21] [F.M. Palmer Collection][9/17/1905].

Levering, Noah

1895 Origin of the Historical Society of Southern California. *In* Annual Publication of the Historical Society of Southern California, Los Angeles 3(3):9-10. University of California Press.

Little, Barbara J.

2007 Historical Archaeology: Why the Past Matters. Walnut Creek: Left Coast Press.

Lummis, Charles Fletcher

N.D.a "Mr. Lummis's Plan". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [3 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][no date].

N.D.b "No Committee was ever "appointed to consider"". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [1 of 4] [Palmer Dispute 1908-1909][no date].

N.D.c “To the Executive Committee of the Southwest Society.” *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.1] [Palmer, Frank M. 1903-1906][No date].

N.D.d “To the Members of the Executive Committee only. In spite”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [3 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][no date].

N.D.e “We have still to complete our payments on the Museum site”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [3 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][no date].

1902 Lummis Journals. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; MS.1.2.1, [Box 68] [The week as was-Anniversaries Dec. 27- Jan 2 of years 1888-1914][1902].

1904 “Dear Palmer: Don’t forget about that article for the magazine” *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; MS.2, [Box 21] [F.M. Palmer Collection][10/31/1904].

1905a “Dear Palmer: The enclosed documents speak for themselves”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; MS.2, [Box 21] [F.M. Palmer Collection][9/17/1905].

1905b “Hon. Francis E. Leupp, Commissioner of Indian Affairs”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; MS.2, [Box 21] [F.M. Palmer Collection][9/16/1905].

1905c “My Dear Mr. Roosevelt”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; MS.2, [Box 21] [F.M. Palmer Collection][9/16/1905].

1906 “To the Honorable, The House Committee, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce” *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.1.1.2724], [Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce][10/25/1906].

1907a A School for American Archaeology. *In Archaeological Institute of America*. Southwest Society, Los Angeles. Bulletin no. 3: Pp.11 [5/1/1907].

1907b Among the Cliff-Dwellers. *In Archaeological Institute of America*. Southwest Society, Los Angeles. Bulletin no. 3: Pp.51-62 [5/1/1907].

1907c Catching our Archaeology Alive. *In* Archaeological Institute of America. Southwest Society, Los Angeles. Bulletin no. 3: Pp.51-62 [5/1/1907].

1907d "My Dear Mr. Seymour" *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; MS.2, [Box 21] [F.M. Palmer Collection][2/28/1907].

1907e "My dear Palmer: I want to thank you, even on my way home to-night". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [4 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][11/23/1907].

1907f The Southwest Museum. *In* Archaeological Institute of America. Southwest Society, Los Angeles. Bulletin no. 3: Pp.3-11 [5/1/1907].

1907fg The Southwest Society. *In* Archaeological Institute of America. Southwest Society, Los Angeles. Bulletin no. 3:Pp.i [5/1/1907].

1909a "At the meeting of April 23, 1909, Dr. Palmer stated that a Museum built". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [2 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][1909].

1909b "At the meetings of this Committee July 2, Dr. Palmer". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [2 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][1909].

1909c "At the meeting of this Executive Committee April 23, 1909, Dr. Palmer revealed a secret". 1909 "At the meetings of this Committee July 2, Dr. Palmer". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [2 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][4/1909].

1909d "Dr. Palmer, as Curator, complained that an article by Edgar L. Hewett". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [3 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][7/1909].

1909e "Dr. Palmer's letter "to the members of this Society" but furnished in the newspapers". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [3 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][6/26/1909].

1909f "Even when patience ceases to be a virtue, we need not be impatient". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library

Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [3 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][6/1909].

1909g “For four years the most serious obstacle to the progress”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [2 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][2/1909].

1909h “I do not remember how many times Dr. Palmer has resigned”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [4 of 4] [Palmer Dispute-1909][1909].

1909i “If there is any method under this Committee would be justified”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [2 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][7/1909].

1909j “I have not injected Dr. Hewett and his plans into the work of the Southwest Society”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [4 of 4] [Palmer Dispute-1909][1909].

1909k “In his circular letter to all members of this Society”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [3 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][7/1909].

1909l “I present herewith copies of the two plans presented for the future”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [3 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][7/1909].

1909m “I profer the following charges against F.M. Palmer, Curator”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [4 of 4] [Palmer Dispute-1909][7/1909].

1909n “My dear Miss Foy: I am very sorry that I can not seriously see my to resign”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [4 of 4] [Palmer Dispute-1909][9/14/1909].

1909o “Whereas, the Southwest Society has for over four years has maintained Dr. F. M. Palmer”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [3 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][7/1909].

1909p "To the Committee of Arbitration, Selected to pass on the differences". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [4 of 4] [Palmer Dispute-1909][1909].

1909q "You can form your own opinion as to the ethics and sanity". 1909 "At the meetings of this Committee July 2, Dr. Palmer". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [2 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][6/1909].

1915 "Hon. Robt. N. Bulla... In returning to you with thanks". *Charles Fletcher Lummis Papers*, 1888-1928, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.1] [4/1/1915]

Lyon, Edwin A.

1989 A Documentation Strategy for Archaeology. *In* Tracing Archaeology's Past: The Historiography of Archaeology. Andrew L. Christianson ed. Pp.187-198. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Marx, Karl

1978 [1867] Capital, Volume One. *In* The Marx-Engels Reader. 2nd edition. Robert C. Tucker ed., Pp. 294-438.

McNitt, Frank

1966 Richard Wetherill Anasazi. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press.

McVicker, Donald

1989 Prejudice and Context: The Anthropological Archaeologist as Historian. *In* Tracing Archaeology's Past: The Historiography of Archaeology. Andrew L. Christianson ed. Pp.113-126. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

1999 Buying a Curator: Establishing Anthropology at Field Columbian Museum. *In* Assembling the Past: Studies in the Professionalization of Archaeology. Alice B. Kehoe and Mary Beth Emmerichs, eds. Pp. 37-52. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Meltzer, David J.

1989 A Question of Relevance. *In* Tracing Archaeology's Past: The Historiography of Archaeology. Andrew L. Christianson ed. Pp.5-20. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Mills, Barbara

2005 Curricular Matters: The Impact of Field Schools on Southwest Archaeology. *In* Southwest Archaeology of the Twentieth Century. Linda S. Cordell and Don D. Fowler, eds. PP. 60-80. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Moore, Jerry D.

1997 *Visions of Culture: An Introduction to Anthropological Theories and Theorists*. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Moratto, Michael J.

1984 *California Archaeology*. Reprinted with new introduction 2004. Salinas: Coyote Press.

Newmark, Marco

1950 Charles Fletcher Lummis. *In* The Historical Society of Southern California Quarterly 32(1):45-60.

Nichols, Catherine A.

2014 Lost in Museums: The Ethical Dimensions of Historical Practices of Anthropological Specimen Exchange. *Curator: The Museum Journal*. 57(2):225-236.

Orser, Charles E. Jr.

1997 Professionalism in Historical Archaeology. *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 1(3):243-255.

Padget, Martin

Travel, Exoticism, and the Writing of Region: Charles Fletcher Lummis and the "Creation" of the Southwest. *Journal of the Southwest* 37(3):421-449.

Palmer, Frank

1905a "Enclosed please find report of expense". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.1.1.3439A][11/2/1905].

1905b "Nucleus of the Southwestern Museum". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [Palmer, F. M. Collection] [Palmer: Southwest Bulletin MS][1905].

1906a "Gentlemen: Referring to the petition of the Southwest museum to be made custodian". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [Palmer, F. M. Collection][12/6/1906].

1906b Reports on Researches Conducted by the Southwest Society of the Archaeological Institute of America. *In* American Journal of Archaeology, Second Series, Journal of the Archaeological Institute of America, Vol. X (1906), No. 1. Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [Palmer Redondo] [Publication + Manuscripts] [Redondo Beach][1906].

1907 [1905]a The First Arizona Expedition. *In* Archaeological Institute of America. Southwest Society, Los Angeles. Bulletin no. 3:Pp.41-48 [5/1/1907] [Reprint from December 1905].

1907b The Palmer-Campbell Collection. *In* Archaeological Institute of America. Southwest Society, Los Angeles. Bulletin no. 3:Pp.63-73 [5/1/1907].

1908 “Dr. Palmer’s Annual Report... In the report which I had the honor to present”. *Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [2 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][11/20/1908].

1909a “Dr. Hector Alliot, Curator, Southwest Museum”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.1.1.3439F][12/3/1909].

1909b “Dr. Palmer’s Plan”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [3 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][6/24/1909].

1909c “Madam Chairman: The order of business for this adjourned meeting”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [4 of 4] [Palmer Dispute-1909][9/1909].

1909d “My Last Word”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [4 of 4] [Palmer Dispute-1909][1909].

1909e “Palmer’s Resignation” *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS. 1.1.3439E] [Palmer, F. M. June 26, 1909- October 1909][10/27/1909].

1909f “Referring to the inclosed communication addressed to me”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS. 1.1.3439F] [10/27/1909].

1909g “This is to inform you that Charles F. Lummis, Secretary of the Southwest Society”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [2 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][6/15/1909].

1909h “To the Board of Directors of the Southwest Museum... The undersigned, (being a committee of five”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [4 of 4] [Palmer Dispute-1909][1909].

1909i “To the Executive Committee I wish to state at the outset that, I have been seriously embarrassed”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [4 of 4] [Palmer Dispute-1909][1909].

1909j “As to the Membership With an iteration and re-iteration that is tedious”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [4 of 4] [Palmer Dispute-1909][1909].

1917 “The First Southern Californians”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [Palmer Manuscripts] [The First Southern Californians][1917].

Patterson, Thomas C.

1995 Toward a Social History of Archaeology in the United States: Case Studies in Archaeology. Jeffery Quilter Editor. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Peale, Charles William

2004 [1792] To the Citizens of the United States of America. *In* Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Pp. 129-130. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Pearce, Susuan M.

1995 On Collecting: An Investigation into Collecting in the European Tradition. New York: Routledge.

Preziosi, Donald

2004 [1996] Brain of the Earth's Body: Museums and the Framing of Modernity. *In* Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Pp. 71-84. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Renfrew, Colin

1986 Varna and the Emergence of Wealth in Prehistoric Europe. *In* The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective. Arjun Appadurai, ed. Pp. 141-168. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reyman, Jonathon E.

1989 The History of Archaeology and the Archaeological History of Chaco Canyon, New Mexico. *In* Tracing Archaeology's Past: The Historiography of Archaeology. Andrew L. Christianson ed. Pp.41-53. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Rotenstein, David S.

1997 *Bending Contexts: A Historical Perspective on Relic Collections*. Paper written for Folklife Studies (FOLK 550), University of Pennsylvania, Fall 1988 term.

Schlereth, Thomas J.

2004 [1978] *Collecting Ideas and Artifacts: Common Problems of History Museums and History Texts*. In *Museum Studies: An Anthology of Contexts*. Ed. Bettina Messias Carbonell. Pp. 335-347. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Seymour, Thomas D.

1907 "My dear Mr. Lummis: Your note of the 10th has just reached me". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [4 of 4] [Palmer Dispute-1909][2/16/1907].

Scott, Joseph

N.D. "Report of Special Committee of the Southwest Society on Question of Re-Affiliation with the Archaeological Institute". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [Palmer-Lummis Controversy/ Palmer Collection][no date].

1909a "Dear Miss Foy: I have thought over the rather acute instance of last Friday". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [4 of 4] [Palmer Dispute-1909][5/10/1909].

1909b "My dear Doctor Palmer: I am in receipt of your letter of the 4th". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [4 of 4] [Palmer Dispute-1909][7/6/1909].

Smith, Wallace E.

1983 *The Reverend Stephen Bowers: "Curiosity Hunter of the Santa Barbara Channel Islands"*. *California History* 62(1):26-37.

Snead, James E.

1999 *Science, Commerce, and Control: Patronage and the Development of Anthropological Archaeology in the Americas*. In *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 101(2) pp. 256-271.

2001 *Ruins and Rivals: The Making of Southwest Archaeology*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press. Susan Allen Heuck ed. Pp.123-140. Boston: Archaeological Institute of America.

2002 *The "Western Idea": Local Societies and American Archaeology*. In *Excavating Our Past: Perspectives in the History of the Archaeological Institute of America*. Susan Heuck Allen, ed. Pp. 123-140. Boston: Archaeological Institute of American.

2005 Paradigms, Professionals, and the Making of Southwest Archaeology, 1910-1920. *In* Southwest Archaeology of the Twentieth Century. Linda S. Cordell and Don D. Fowler, eds. PP. 27-46. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Suarez, Andrew V. and Neil D. Tsutsui

2004 The Value of Museum Collections for Research and Society. *BioScience* 54(1):66-74.

Sutherland, F.T.

1909 "My dear Lummis: The circular letter June 26th". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [2 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][7/5/1909].

Thoresen, Timothy H. H.

1975 Playing the Piper and Calling the Tune: The Beginnings of Academic Anthropology in California. *Journal of the History of Behavioral Sciences* 11(3):257-275.

Van Valkenburgh, Richard

1930 Notes on Redondo Sites, Redondo Beach, Calif. At Malaga Cove, Palos Verdes and in the Town of Redondo. William Wallace Manuscript Collection. Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA. [MS.10] [T2055-166] [Malaga Cover, Historical Research, Van Valkenburgh Original Notes][7/20/1930].

Will, Elizabeth Lyding

2002 Charles Elliot Norton and the Archaeological Institute of America. *In* Excavating our Past: Perspectives on the History of the Archaeological Institute of America. Susan Heuck Allen, ed. Pp. 49-62. Boston: Archaeological Institute of American.

Woodbury, Richard B and Nathalie F. S. Woodbury

1999 The Rise and Fall of the Bureau of American Ethnology. *Journal of the Southwest* 41(3):283-296.

Yasaitis, Kelly Elizabeth

2006 Collecting Culture and the British Museum. *Curator* 49(4):449-462.

No Author Archival Material

No Author

1903 "Constitution of the Southwest Society, Archaeological Institute of America". *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [3 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][1903].

No Author

1906 “Minutes of conference of the Southwest Society, A.I.A., with Mr. C. P. Bowditch”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [F.M. Palmer Collection][4/26/1906].

No Author

1909a “A movement of this sort depends upon enthusiasm”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [3 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][6/1909].

No Author

1909b “Dear Sir: Replying to your circular letter of June 15th”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [Palmer Correspondence][6/18/1909].

No Author

1909c “Mr. Lummis who is regarded as the founder of the Southwest”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [F.M. Palmer Collection][1909].

No Author

1909d “Memorandum of Conversation Between Dr. Lummis and Dr. Palmer”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [3 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][6/16/1909].

No Author

1909e “On the 27th day of October, you were requested by order of the Directors”. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.1.1.3439F] [6/16/1909].

No Author Identified Historic Newspaper Articles

Los Angeles Times, “All Over “Injuns.” Feud Settled by Heavy Men.” October 6, 1909:II1, from ProQuest Historical Newspapers.
<http://search.proquest.com/libproxy.csun.edu/hnplatimes/docview/159421097/FB7A7E2787144754PQ/1?accountid=7285> (accessed April 18, 2015).

Los Angeles Herald “Archaeologist Scores Lummis: Secretary of Southwest Society Attacked.” Vol. 36. *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [3 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][June 22, 1909].

Los Angeles Times, “Archaeological Treasures Found at Redondo.” June 14, 1903:C9 from ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

<http://search.proquest.com.libproxy.csun.edu/hnplatimes/docview/164185900/F08645D346DA479CPQ/1?accountid=7285> (accessed April 18, 2015).

Los Angeles Times, "Chamber of Commerce: New Exhibit of Indian Relics- California House at World's Fair will be a Stunner." August 12, 1903:A7 from ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

<http://search.proquest.com.libproxy.csun.edu/hnplatimes/docview/164200159/B00ED70FB19D4BD2PQ/1?accountid=7285> (accessed April 18, 2015).

Los Angeles Times, "Good Finds Coming Here, Local Museum will Receive Valuable Additions." November 10, 1907:II15 from ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

<http://search.proquest.com.libproxy.csun.edu/hnplatimes/docview/159140396/C1E32EA607D45EDPQ/1?accountid=7285> (Accessed April 18, 2015).

Los Angeles Times, "Hell Popping: Archaeology Gets Coltish: Kicks and Snorts from Two Famous Explorers." *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [3 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][June 24,1909].

Los Angeles Times, "Like Concave Turtle Shell: Marvelous Ancient Pottery is so Described." 3/14/1908:II6 from ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

<http://search.proquest.com.libproxy.csun.edu/hnplatimes/docview/159130476/55C0D8BE88F84DB8PQ/1?accountid=7285> (accessed April 18, 2015).

Los Angeles Herald, "Museum Curator in Tilt with Secretary." *Southwest Society Institutional Archives*, 1903-1917, Braun Research Library Collection, Autry National Center, Los Angeles, CA; [MS.2], [Box 21] [3 of 4] [Palmer/Lummis Debate][June 23,1909].

Los Angeles Times, "Rare Relics For Museum: Channel Islands Collection Under Negotiation." November 24, 1907: II12, from ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

<http://search.proquest.com.libproxy.csun.edu/hnplatimes/docview/159214373/EEE0AF0517EE4087PQ/1?accountid=7285> (accessed April 18, 2015).

Los Angeles Times, "Rarest Relics Found for Finest Museum: Chamber of Commerce Accepts Valuable Specimens." September 24,1903:11, from ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

<http://search.proquest.com.libproxy.csun.edu/hnplatimes/docview/164275543/6C138D8A02264F14PQ/1?accountid=7285> (accessed April 18, 2015).

Los Angeles Times, "Settled. Glaze Dispute Sees Finish. Southwest Museum Holds the Evidence." October 6, 1907:V18 from ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

<http://search.proquest.com.libproxy.csun.edu/hnplatimes/docview/159239103/B92C08EC2CB347A4PQ/1?accountid=7285> (accessed April 18, 2015).

Los Angeles Times, "Southern California Dentists." November 19, 1891:8. From ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

<http://search.proquest.com.libproxy.csun.edu/hnplatimes/docview/163538805/AE8C9A4906FC406CPQ/5?accountid=7285> (accessed April 18, 2015).

Los Angeles Times, "Southwest Society: Spanish Dinner at Lummis' Dr. Seymours Lecture on Excavations in Greek Lands." November 5, 1905:II2 from ProQuest Historical Newspapers.

<http://search.proquest.com.libproxy.csun.edu/hnplatimes/docview/164347027/B475BB3230694E91PQ/2?accountid=7285> (accessed April 18, 2015).

Los Angeles Herald, "Then There Were Indians: Dr. F.M. Palmer's Remarkable Collection of Relics." November 15, 1893:4 from California Digital Newspaper Collection.

<http://cdnc.ucr.edu/cgi-bin/cdnc?a=d&d=LAH18931115.2.36&e=-----en--20--1--txt-txIN-----> (accessed April 18, 2015).

Appendix A: Artifact Catalogue

ID NUMBER	OBJECT NAME	MATERIAL	LOCATION	DESCRIPTIONS	NOTES	OBJECT DESCRIPTION FROM 1919 INVENTORY	Surface Find/Grave/Shell Mound Find
Santa Rosa Island							
2.P.6	Barb fishhook	bone	Santa Rosa Island	thin, double sided worked to a fine point	2 3/4" L	Barb fishhook	Grave
2.P.7	Barb fishhook	bone	Santa Rosa Island	thin, double sided worked to a fine point	2 1/4" L	Barb fishhook	Grave
2.P.8	Barb fishhook	bone	Santa Rosa Island	thin, double sided worked to a fine point	2 1/2" L	Barb fishhook	Grave
2.P.10	Barb fishhook	bone	Santa Rosa Island	thin, double sided worked to a fine point	2 3/4" L	Barb fishhook	Grave
2.P.12	Barb fishhook	bone	Santa Rosa Island	worked to a fine point on both sides	2 3/4" L	Barb fishhook	Grave
2.P.13	Barb fishhook	bone	Santa Rosa Island	Duplicate? Flaking tool with evidence of asphaltum on the ends. Has 111-1-71 B.C. on it. May not be a Palmer artifact.	3 1/4" L	Barb fishhook	Grave
2.P.14	Barb fishhook	bone	Santa Rosa Island	worked to a fine point on both sides	4 1/4" L	Barb fishhook	Grave
2.P.22	Awl	bone	Santa Rosa Island		Says 'flaker' on object; 3 3/4" L	Perforator	Mound Find

2.P.25	Whistle	bone	Santa Rosa Island	Hollow (now filled with dirt), with one hole on one side.	2 1/4" L	Whistle	Grave
2.P.26	Whistle	bone	Santa Rosa Island	Hollow (now filled with dirt), with one hole on one side.	2 3/4" L	Whistle	Grave
2.P.28	Whistle	bone	Santa Rosa Island	Hollow (now filled with dirt), with one hole on one side.	3" L	Whistle	Grave
2.P.33	Pendant	bone	Santa Rosa Island	Asphaltum glue on top with visible striations from where it was bound. Carved bone.		Ornament	Grave
2.P.37	bone tool	bone	Santa Rosa Island	One side flat, the other has two small hook like protrusions on the ends. Maybe used to hold string?		Shuttle shaped implement	Surface Find
2.P.38	Incised Tool	bone	Santa Rosa Island	Looks like it held string, or had a very specific function. Incised on both sides.	4" L	Implement	Grave
2.P.41	Bead	bone	Santa Rosa Island		3" L	Tube	Grave
2.P.42	Bead	bone	Santa Rosa Island	shaped with a groove in the middle	1 1/4" L	Tube	Grave
2.P.48	Awl	bone	Santa Rosa Island	Sharpened to a point on one end, evidence of asphaltum over it		Perforator or awl	Shell Mound

2.P.49	Awl	bone	Santa Rosa Island			Perforator	Mound Find
2.P.50	Awl	bone	Santa Rosa Island	worked all over, flattened, smoothed and curved with a sharp point at distal end.		Perforator	Surface Find
2.P.51	Awl	bone	Santa Rosa Island		5" L	Perforator	Mound Find
2.P.54	Perforator	bone	Santa Rosa Island	long, curved, shaped	9" L	Perforator	Grave
2.P.69	Incised bone	bone	Santa Rosa Island	fragment of thinned bone with incised designs on one side.		Implement	Grave
2.P.70	bone tool	bone	Santa Rosa Island	chisel or pry.	16 1/5"	Implement	Grave
2.P.93	Bead	bone	Santa Rosa Island	Small, thin bone bead		Bead	Shell Mound
2.P.102	Pendant	stone	Santa Rosa Island	steatite; smoothed, shaped into a oval shaped. Perforated twice at either end		Bead	Grave
2.P.117	Pendant	stone	Santa Rosa Island	smoothed and shaped, perforated hole at distal end; steatite		Pendant	Grave
2.P.130	Bead	stone	Santa Rosa Island	smooth and rounded, thick steatite bead; 2 objects labeled 2.P.130. Second bead is a longer		Bead	Grave
2.P.134	Bead	stone	Santa Rosa Island	Incised, steatite, smoothed		Bead	Grave
2.P.136	Bead	Stone	Santa Rosa Island	Stone			
2.P.301	Ornament	shell	Santa Rosa Island	Abalone shell, 4 perforations		Dress Ornaments	Grave

2.P.303	Ornament	shell	Santa Rosa Island	Abalone shell, 4 perforations		Dress Ornaments	Grave
2.P.304	Ornament	shell	Santa Rosa Island	Abalone shell, 3 perforations		Dress Ornaments	Grave
2.P.305	Ornament	shell	Santa Rosa Island	Abalone, thick on one side, thinned on other; 3 perforations		Dress Ornaments	Grave
2.P.306	Ornament	shell	Santa Rosa Island	Abalone shell, thick; 5 perforations		Dress Ornaments	Grave
2.P.307	Ornament	shell	Santa Rosa Island	Abalone shell, 4 perforations		Dress Ornaments	Grave
2.P.308	Ornament	shell	Santa Rosa Island	Abalone shell, shaped into a circle-shape, incised along edges, 11 perforations		Dress Ornaments	Grave
2.P.310	Ornament	shell	Santa Rosa Island	Abalone shell, shaped into a rough circle, 24 perforations along outer edges, some broken, one perforation in center.		Dress Ornaments	Grave
2.P.312	Ornament	shell	Santa Rosa Island	Abalone, curved. Probably a pendant. 2 perforations along one edge		do. & Pendants	Grave
2.P.313	Ornament	shell	Santa Rosa Island	Abalone, rough triangular shaped, small incising along outer edges. 4 perforations.		do. & Pendants	Grave

2.P.344	Pendant	shell	Santa Rosa Island	Abalone, long and curved with a single perforation through it lengthwise.		beads	Grave
2.P.349	Pendant	shell	Santa Rosa Island	Shell pendant, inside portion of a shell, carved; 1 perforation on one end		Pendant	Grave
2.P.421	bi-facially flaked stone tool	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bifacially worked to a point on either end. Chalcedony		Spearhead	Surface find
2.P.629	donut stone	stone	Santa Rosa Island	steatite, smoothed		Mace-head	Grave
2.P.638	Pendant	stone	Santa Rosa Island	possibly an effigy pendant		Porpoise	Grave
2.P.661	pipe fragment	stone	Santa Rosa Island	Pipe base; broken		cone-shaped cup	Grave
2.P.665	dish	stone	Santa Rosa Island	soapstone, small, circular		cup	Grave
2.P.420	projectile point	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, mottled chert; rounded base		Spearhead	Surface find
2.P.437	projectile point	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, chert, coastal contacting cluster; rounded base	2.4" L	Arrowheads	NA (Most Likely a Surface Find)
2.P.438	projectile point	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, chert, coastal contacting cluster	2.4" L	Arrowheads	NA (Most Likely a Surface Find)
2.P.439	projectile point	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, fused shale, coastal contracting Cluster	2.3" L	Arrowheads	NA (Most Likely a Surface Find)

2.P.441	projectile point	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, chalcedony, serrated edges, coastal contacting cluster	2.1" L	Arrowheads	NA (Most Likely a Surface Find)
2.P.442	projectile point	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, chert, coastal contacting cluster	1.7" L	Arrowheads	NA (Most Likely a Surface Find)
2.P.444	projectile point	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, chert, coastal contacting cluster	1.4" L	Arrowheads	NA (Most Likely a Surface Find)
2.P.455	projectile point	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, slightly notched base	1.3"L	Arrowheads	NA (Most Likely a Surface Find)
2.P.457	projectile point	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, slightly notched base	1.2" L	Arrowheads	NA (Most Likely a Surface Find)
2.P.458	projectile point	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, chert, coastal contacting cluster; rounded base	2.5" L	Arrowheads	NA (Most Likely a Surface Find)
2.P.459	projectile point	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, chert, coastal contacting cluster, slightly notched base	1.6" L	Arrowheads	NA (Most Likely a Surface Find)
2.P.460	projectile point	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, chert, coastal contacting cluster	2.1" L	Arrowheads	NA (Most Likely a Surface Find)
2.P.461	projectile point	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, jasper	1.8" L	Arrowheads	NA (Most Likely a Surface Find)
2.P.462	projectile point	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, chert, coastal contacting cluster	1.4" L	Arrowheads	NA (Most Likely a Surface Find)
2.P.463	projectile point	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, chert, coastal contacting cluster	1.7" L	Arrowheads	NA (Most Likely a Surface Find)
2.P.464	projectile point	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, chert, coastal contacting cluster	1.8" L	Arrowheads	NA (Most Likely a Surface Find)

2.P.465	projectile point	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, fused shale, Humboldt Cluster	1.5" L	Arrowheads	NA (Most Likely a Surface Find)
2.P.484	crescent	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, chalcedony	2.9" L	Crescent-shaped scrapers	Surface find
2.P.487	crescent	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, broken and re-touched	1.7" L	Crescent-shaped scrapers	Surface find
2.P.488	crescent	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, re-touched	1.5" L	Crescent-shaped scrapers	Surface find
2.P.490	crescent	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial	1.7" L	Crescent-shaped scrapers	Surface find
2.P.497	crescent	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facial, chert	1.6" L	Crescent-shaped scrapers	Surface find
2.P.498	flaked stone tool	stone	Santa Rosa Island	one side serrated	2.4" L	Saws	NA (Most likely a Surface Find)
2.P.499	crescent	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facially worked, one serrated on either side of non-curved portion	3.3" L	Saws	NA (Most Likely a Surface Find)
2.P.500	crescent	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facially worked, serrated on curved and flat edges	2" L	Saws	NA (Most likely a Surface Find)
2.P.501	flaked stone tool	stone	Santa Rosa Island	possible effigy	1.8" L	Saws	NA (Most Likely a Surface Find)
2.P.503A	flaked stone tool	stone	Santa Rosa Island	possible effigy	1.6" L	Saws	NA (Most likely a Surface Find)
2.P.503	projectile point	stone	Santa Rosa Island	bi-facially worked to a point on both ends, coastal contracting cluster	2.1" L	Saws	NA (Most Likely a Surface Find)
2.P.508	projectile point	stone	Santa Rosa Island	fused shale, Coastal Contracting Cluster	3" L	Knives	NA (Most likely a Surface Find)
2.P.637	Effigy	stone	Santa Rosa Island	Small stone whale effigy. Polished.		Fish stone	Grave

2.P.649	Stone spike	stone	Santa Rosa Island	6.4" in length		Stone implement like spike	Grave
San Miguel Island							
2.P.110	Bead	stone	San Miguel Island	Long, tube bead.	Banded stone	Bead	Grave
2.P.115	Pendant	stone	San Miguel Island	incised in the center where it was tied	steatite	Pendant	Grave
2.P.150	Bead	stone	San Miguel Island		steatite bead, elongated	Bead	Grave
2.P.164	Bead	stone	San Miguel Island	Very small stone bead		Bead	Grave
2.P.165	Bead	stone	San Miguel Island	Very small stone bead	steatite	Bead	Grave
2.P.183	Charm	stone	San Miguel Island	Fragmented	Quartz	Charm	Grave
2.P.335	Ornament	Shell	San Miguel Island	3 perforated holes	Abalone	Dress Ornament	Grave
San Luis Obispo							
2.P.569	bi-facial point	Stone	San Luis Obispo	Chalcedony; Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster		Knives	NA
2.P.39	Bead?	Bone	San Luis Obispo	Long, rounded bone with thin walls. Asphaltum on either end		Tube	Grave
2.P.87	Bone vessel	Bone	San Luis Obispo	double sided worked vertebra with evidence of pigment on both ends.		Paint Pot	Grave
2.P.91	Beads	Bone	San Luis Obispo	10 small bone beads in tube shapes.		Beads	Grave

2.P.95	Ornaments	Metal	San Luis Obispo	Metal buttons and ornaments, many still attached to decaying thread	Historical	Buttons	Grave
2.P.96	Ornaments	Metal	San Luis Obispo	2 metal buttons	Historical	Buttons	Grave
2.P.97	Ornaments	Metal	San Luis Obispo	3 metal buttons	Historical	Buttons	Grave
2.P.98	Ornaments	Metal	San Luis Obispo	1 metal button	Historical	Buttons	Grave
2.P.99	Metal object	Metal	San Luis Obispo	Possibly a small metal bell. Perforated hole on one end with a bell shape on the other	Historical	Brass Cup	Grave
2.P.100	Sword Hilt	Metal	San Luis Obispo	A fragment of a sword hilt	Historical	Sword Hilt	Grave
2.P.171	Shell Object	Shell	San Luis Obispo	Most likely an ornamental object. Inside of a shell, shaped and polished.		Charm	Grave
2.P.172	Shell Object	Shell	San Luis Obispo	Most likely an ornamental object. Inside of a shell, shaped and polished.		Charm	Grave
2.P.181	Stone object	Stone	San Luis Obispo	most likely a small weight. Rounded on either end with a groove through the middle.		Charm	Grave
2.P.238	Projectile Point	Stone	San Luis Obispo	Malaga Cove Cluster	Fused shale	Spear Point	Surface
2.P.239	Projectile Point	Stone	San Luis Obispo	Thick, probably a dart point.	Fused shale		Surface

2.P.364	Beads	Shell	San Luis Obispo	4 shell beads. Varying shapes and designs	Very chalky shell.	Beads	Grave
2.P.370	Necklace	Shell	San Luis Obispo	Small shell beads.		Necklace	Grave
2.P.378	Necklace	Glass	San Luis Obispo	Small red glass beads	Historical	Necklace	Grave
2.P.383	Necklace	Glass	San Luis Obispo	Really small white beads with red, blue or green stripes on each.	Historical	Necklace	Grave
2.P.385	Necklace	Glass	San Luis Obispo	Small red glass beads	Historical	Necklace	Grave
2.P.394	Necklace	Glass	San Luis Obispo	Very small red beads with small white beads with green stripes on them. One larger red bead.	Historical	Necklace	Grave
2.P.395	Necklace	Glass	San Luis Obispo	Glass beads , some with incising, some decorated and painted	Historical	Necklace	Grave
2.P.396	Necklace	Glass	San Luis Obispo	Glass beads of varying size. Red, green, blue and green.	Historical	Necklace	Grave
2.P.400	Necklace		San Luis Obispo	Small red, blue and green glass beads	Historical	Necklace	Grave
2.P.407	bi-facially flaked stone tool	Stone	San Luis Obispo	6.2" in length.	Fused shale	Ceremonial Knife	Grave
2.P.408	bi-facially flaked stone tool	Stone	San Luis Obispo	8.2" in length. Thin and narrow.	Fused shale	Ceremonial Knife	Grave
2.P.558	Projectile Point	Stone	San Luis Obispo	Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster. Worked to a point on both sides.	Chert	Arrowheads	NA

2.P.561	Projectile Point	Stone	San Luis Obispo	Bi-facially flaked, thick body	Chert	Spearheads	NA
2.P.564	Projectile Point	Stone	San Luis Obispo	Bi-facially flaked, thinned.		Arrowheads	NA
2.P.564A	Projectile Point	Stone	San Luis Obispo	bi-facially flaked, Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster	Fused shale	NA	NA
2.P.563	Projectile Point	Stone	San Luis Obispo	bi-facially flaked, Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.564B	Projectile Point	Stone	San Luis Obispo	bi-facially flaked, Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster	Chert	NA	NA
2.P.566	Projectile Point	Stone	San Luis Obispo	bi-facially flaked, Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster. Large barbs.	Volcanic	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.570	Projectile Point	Stone	San Luis Obispo	bi-facially flaked, Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.633	Sinker	Stone	San Luis Obispo	Small with a single groove around the center of object. Weathered.		Grooved Sinker	Shell mound
2.P.717	Pestle	Stone	San Luis Obispo	broken in half. Evidence of hammering on both ends.	Igneous stone	Pestle	Grave
Santa Barbara							

2.P.73	Small Bone Bowl	Bone	Santa Barbara	carved from a vertebra	Evidence of pigment in the interior. Most likely used as a paint pot.	Paint Pot	Grave
2.P.106	Bead	Stone	Santa Barbara	Long, smoothed bead.	Steatite.	Bead	Grave
2.P.118	Bead	Stone	Santa Barbara	Smoothed on the exterior, incised design on one side.	Circular ring shape.	Ring	Grave
2.P.132	Bead	Stone	Santa Barbara	Small, smoothed stone bead.	Steatite.	Bead	Grave
2.P.138	Beads	Stone	Santa Barbara	7 small smoothed beads of varying shape: some have flattened sides, others are almost round.	Steatite and soapstone.	Bead	Grave
2.P.154	Bead	Stone	Santa Barbara	Long, thin bead.	Steatite.	Bead	Grave
2.P.155	Bead	Stone	Santa Barbara	Long, thin bead.	Steatite.	Bead	Grave
2.P.156	Bead	Stone	Santa Barbara	Long, thin bead.	Steatite.	Bead	Grave
2.P.166	Bead	Stone	Santa Barbara	Small, smoothed stone bead.	Steatite.	Bead	Grave
2.P.167	Bead	Stone	Santa Barbara	Small, smoothed stone bead.	Steatite.	Bead	Grave
2.P.322	Ornament	Shell	Santa Barbara	Thin, round, small shell. Most likely a decorative item such as a bead.	Abalone	Rings	Grave
2.P.338	Button	Shell	Santa Barbara	Circular with one small hole in center.	Abalone	Perforated Disks	Grave

2.P.382	Necklaces	Stone	Santa Barbara	4 necklaces. Small beads and of varying lengths. Beads are mostly green with some red and blue.	Appears to be historical based on stone color. Possibly made of glass.	Necklace	Grave
2.P.387	Necklaces	Glass	Santa Barbara	2 glass bead necklaces, beads of varying size.	Red, Blue and green beads. Historical.	Necklace	Grave
2.P.388	Necklace	Glass	Santa Barbara	small red beads.	Historical.	Necklace	Grave
2.P.390	Necklace	Glass	Santa Barbara	Very small white beads with red, blue or green stripes on each.	Historical.	Necklace	Grave
2.P.391	Necklace	Glass	Santa Barbara	small blue and red beads.	Historical.	Necklace	Grave
2.P.398	Necklace	Glass	Santa Barbara	Dark blue glass beads.	Historical.	Necklace	Grave
2.P.405	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	Contracting Coastal Cluster.	Small protruding base for hafting. Chalcedony	Spear head	Grave
2.P.409	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	Contracting Coastal Cluster.	Rounded base. Chert.	Spear head	Grave
2.P.410	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	Bi-facially flaked, rounded base	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.411	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	bi-facially flaked, rounded base, long point on proximal end.	Chert	Arrowheads	NA

2.P.412	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	Bi-facially flaked, rounded base (Coastal Contracting Cluster)	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.414	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	Bi-facially flaked, rounded base (Coastal Contracting Cluster)	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.416	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	bi-facially flaked, protruding base for hafting (Coastal Contracting Cluster)	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.417	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	bi-facially flaked, protruding base for hafting (Coastal Contracting Cluster)	Fused shale	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.419	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	bi-facially flaked to a point on both ends	CCS	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.426	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	Bi-facially flaked, notched	CCS	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.428	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	bi-facially flaked, slightly notched	Fused shale	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.429	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	bi-facially flaked, slightly notched (Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster)	CCS	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.430	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	bi-facially flaked, slightly notched (Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster)	Chert	Arrowheads	NA

2.P.433	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	bi-facially flaked, slightly notched (Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster)	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.434	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	Bi-facially flaked, notched	basalt	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.514	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	Bi-facially flaked, rounded base	banded chert	Knives	NA
2.P.516	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	Bi-facially flaked, rounded base (Coastal Contracting Cluster)	Chert	Knives	NA
2.P.518	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	bi-facially flaked to a point on both ends	Chert	Knives	NA
2.P.522	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	bi-facially flaked, notched (Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster)	Chert	Knives	NA
2.P.526	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	Bi-facially flaked, rounded base (Coastal Contracting Cluster)	CCS	Knives	NA
2.P.527	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	Bi-facially flaked, rounded base (Coastal Contracting Cluster)	Chert	Knives	NA
2.P.528	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	bi-facially flaked, asphaltum on one half	Chert	Knives	NA
2.P.528A	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	Very small bi-facially flaked point.	Obsidian	Drills	NA

2.P.541 (1)	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	Bi-facially flaked (Humboldt Cluster)	Chalcedony	Drills	NA
2.P.541 (2)	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	bi-facially flaked (Pinto Clusters)	Obsidian	Drills	NA
2.P.546	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Barbara	Small, thin bi-facially flaked stone tool	Chert	Drills	NA
2.P.630	Ground stone object	Stone	Santa Barbara	Steatite. Smoothed into an oval shape with a hollowed out center. Evidence of use on the interior.	Possible weight	Mace Head	Grave
Redondo Beach							
2.P.868	Canoe effigy	Stone	Redondo Beach?	Beautifully carved, striations on inside and outside of vessel.	Soapstone.	Canoe	NA
2.P.872	Stone bowl	Stone	Redondo Beach?	Beautifully carved, rectangular in shape. Dirt caked on bottom. Most likely a grave find	Soapstone.	Food vessel	NA
2.P.873	Stone bowl	Stone	NA	small stone bowl	Sandstone	Cup or pot	NA
2.P.875	Stone spike or chisel	Stone	NA	Possibly Redondo Beach	Basalt	Chisel	NA
2.P.876	Stone spike	Stone	NA	6.5" in length.		NA	NA
2.P.856	Stone spike	Stone	NA	Broken in half, 8" in length		Spike	NA
2.P.857	Stone spike or chisel	Stone	NA	11' in length. Proximal end is blunted		Spike	NA

2.P.858	Stone spike	Stone	NA	6" in length. Possibly from Redondo Beach. Damaged, but still intact	Note in bag says collected in 1903	Spike	NA
2.P.873	Stone bowl	Stone	NA	small stone bowl	Sandstone	Cup or pot	NA
2.P.875	Stone spike or chisel	Stone	NA	Possibly Redondo Beach	Basalt	Chisel	NA
2.P.876	Stone spike	Stone	NA	6.5" in length.		NA	NA
2.P.879	Stone spike or chisel	Stone	NA	large. Evidence of hammering on proximal end	Has "S. California" written on it	NA	NA
2.P.979	Hammerstone	Stone	NA	Evidence of hammering on one end		NA	NA
2.P.1003	Mano	Stone	NA	Large. One side smooth. Evidence of hammering on one end		NA	NA
2.P.1006	Mano	Stone	NA	Hammering on both ends.		NA	NA
2.P.885	Pelican Stone	Stone	NA	Small steatite bird stone	no description on sheet	NA	NA
2.P.901	Pelican Stone	Stone	NA	Smoothed into a shovel-shape	Smoothed steatite into a shovel-shape	NA	NA
2.P.902	Pelican Stone	Stone	NA	Steatite pelican stone		NA	NA
2.P.904	Pelican Stone	Stone	NA	Small, smoothed stone			
2.P.976	mano	Stone	NA	Cobble mano	No number	NA	NA
2.P.977	Chopper	Stone	NA	Chopper with flakes removed from one end	Not on sheet	NA	NA
2.P.978	Mano	Stone	NA	Small bifacial mano	Not on sheet	NA	NA

2.P.980	Chopper	Stone	NA	Flakes removed from one side to form a rough edge	Not on sheet	NA	NA
2.P.981	Hammerstone	Stone	NA	Evidence of hammering on one end	Not on sheet	NA	NA
2.P.984	Hammerstone	Stone	NA	Small pebble that has evidence of hammering on one end	Not on sheet	NA	NA
2.P.990	Pestle	Stone	NA	Basalt, polished by grinding	Not on sheet	NA	NA
2.P.991	Chopper	Stone	NA	Evidence of hammering on one end	Not on sheet	NA	NA
2.P.992	Hammerstone	Stone	NA	Evidence of hammering on one end	Not on sheet	NA	NA
2.P.994	mano	Stone	NA	Evidence of grinding on several surfaces	Not on sheet	NA	NA
2.P.996	Grinding stone	Stone	NA	Evidence of grinding on three surfaces and evidence of hammering on the distal and proximal ends.	Not on sheet	NA	NA
2.P.997	Stone tool	Stone	NA	Possibly used for hammering or percussion flaking	Not on sheet	NA	NA
2.P.998	Hammerstone	Stone	NA	Evidence of hammering on several surfaces	Not on sheet	NA	NA

2.P.999	Hammerstone	Stone	NA	Flakes removed and evidence of hammering	Not on sheet	NA	NA
2.P.1000	Hammerstone	Stone	NA	Flakes removed and evidence of hammering	Not on sheet	NA	NA
2.P.1001	Hammerstone	Stone	NA	Small hammerstone, evidence of hammering on two ends	Not on sheet	NA	NA
2.P.1002	Mano	Stone	NA	Large, double handed grinding stone	Not on sheet	NA	NA
2.P.1004	Mano	Stone	NA	Unifacial mano	Not on sheet	NA	NA
Catalina Island							
2.P.60	Bone tool	Bone	Catalina	Thinned bone pry.		Implement	Grave
2.P.140	Ornament	Stone	Catalina	small stone ring, most likely an ornament.		Ring	Grave
2.P.317	Pendant	Shell	Catalina	Small, thin shell pendant. One perforated hole.	Abalone.	Pendant	Grave
2.P.326	Ornament	Shell	Catalina	Carved shell pendant.	Abalone.	Pendant	Grave
2.P.333	Ornament	Shell	Catalina	carved and incised shell ornament with three perforations.	Abalone.	Pendant	Grave
2.P.339	Buttons	Shell	Catalina	3 round shell buttons.	Abalone.	Buttons	Grave
2.P.342	Pendant	Shell	Catalina	Thinned shell pendant.	Abalone.	Dress Ornaments	Grave
2.P.348	Shell Bead Blanks	Shell	Catalina	3 long, hollowed out shell bead blanks		Pins	Grave
2.P.363	Beads	Shell	Catalina	9 shell beads		Beads	Grave

2.P.381	Beads	Glass	Catalina	Hundreds of small glass beads in blue, green, white and red.		Necklace	Grave
2.P.592	Projectile point	Stone	Catalina	Bi-facially flaked. Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster.	Banded chert.	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.593	Projectile point	Stone	Catalina	Bi-facially flaked. Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster.	Obsidian	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.594	Projectile point	Stone	Catalina	Bi-facially flaked. Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster.	Chert.	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.594A	Projectile point	Stone	Catalina	Bi-facially flaked. Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster.	Fused shale.	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.596	Projectile point	Stone	Catalina	Bi-facially flaked. Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster.	Fused shale.	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.597	Projectile point	Stone	Catalina	Bi-facially flaked. Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster.	Fused shale.	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.598	Projectile point	Stone	Catalina	Bi-facially flaked. Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster.	Fused shale.	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.599	Projectile point	Stone	Catalina	Bi-facially flaked. Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster.	Chert.	Arrowheads	NA

2.P.600	Projectile point	Stone	Catalina	Bi-facially flaked. Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster.	Obsidian	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.615	Stone Implement	Stone	Catalina	Flat groundstone object; possible camal fragment.	Serpentine	Spoon shaped Implement	Grave
2.P.642	Pelican Stone	Stone	Catalina	smoothed pelican stone with a particularly long hook portion.	Soapstone	Hook-shaped Implement	Grave
2.P.643	Pelican Stone	Stone	Catalina	Small pelican stone, smoothed and polished	Soapstone	Hook-shaped Implement	Grave
2.P.644	Stone Implement	Stone	Catalina	Small curved stone object with a small hook on one side. Highly polished. Incised.	Soapstone	Hook-shaped Implement	Grave
2.P.667	Ladle	Stone	Catalina	Smoothed steatite bowl with handle, most likely used as a ladle.	Steatite.	Cup	Shell Mound
2.P.669	Stone Bowl	Stone	Catalina	Small stone bowl with incised base.	Soapstone	Cup	Grave
2.P.682	Comal	Stone	Catalina	Small triangle shaped comal with one perforation.	Soapstone	Griddle	Grave
2.P.683	Comal	Stone	Catalina	Small triangle shaped comal with one perforation.	Soapstone	Griddle	Grave
2.P.685	Polishing Stone	Stone	Catalina	One side completely flat and smooth	Serpentine	Polishing Stone	Grave

2.P.380	Necklace	Glass	Catalina	Necklace made with small blue glass beads.		Necklace	Grave
2.P.384	Necklace	Glass	Catalina	Necklace made with small blue, green, white and red glass beads.		Necklace	Grave
2.P.706	Pelican Stone	Stone	Catalina	small carved steatite. Possible effigy or bird stone		Use unknown	Grave
San Clemente							
2.P.24	Awl	Bone	San Clemente	Highly polished bone awl. Perforated on the distal end/	Has "Eskimo" written on object	Needle	Shell Mound
2.P.57	Bone Implement	Bone	San Clemente	Worked to a point on one end.		Hairpin	Grave
Los Angeles County							
2.P.4	Fish hook	shell	LA County	Complete fish hook	Abalone.	Fish Hook	Shell Mound
2.P.15	Bone Tool	Bone	LA County	Small, thin piece of bone thinned to a point on both ends. Most likely an awl or perforator.		Harpoon	Grave
2.P.18	Awl	Bone	LA County	Curved and smoothed bone tool, worked to a point on one end.		Harpoon	Surface
2.P.21	Bone fragment	Bone	LA County	Broken, one end has a perforation		Needle	Shell Mound
2.P.46	Bone tool	Bone	LA County	Small, small piece of bone. Probably a barb for fishing.		Barb for Harpoon	Surface

2.P.52	Awl	Bone	LA County	Large handle and worked to a point on one end		Perforator	Surface
2.P.62	Ornament	Bone	LA County	Polished vertebra? Small perforations around sides.		Ornament	Surface
2.P.77	Bone Tool	Bone	LA County	Small, small piece of bone. Probably a barb for fishing.		Small round pointed barb-like implements	Surface
2.P.78	Bone Tool	Bone	LA County	Small, small piece of bone. Probably a barb for fishing.		Small round pointed barb-like implements	Surface
2.P.79	Bone Tool	Bone	LA County	Small, small piece of bone. Probably a barb for fishing.		Small round pointed barb-like implements	Surface
2.P.80	Bone Tool	Bone	LA County	Small, small piece of bone. Probably a barb for fishing.		Small round pointed barb-like implements	Surface
2.P.82	Awl	Bone	LA County	Small, worked to a point on one end		Perforator	Surface
2.P.83	Awl	Bone	LA County	Small, worked to a point on one end		Perforator	Surface
2.P.139	Bead	Stone	LA County	Round, thick stone bead.	Serpentine	Bead	Grave
2.P.341	Ornaments	Shell	LA County	2 pendant like shell decorative objects. One large hole and one small perforation	Abalone.	Dress Ornaments	Grave

2.P.358	Ornament	Shell	LA County	Round shell ornament, possible button. One perforation in center.		Pendants	Surface
2.P.413	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Coastal contracting stem cluster.	White chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.424	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Pacific Coast Side Notched Cluster	CCS	Arrowheads	NA
1.P.427	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Pacific Coast Side Notched Cluster	CCS	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.431	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Pacific Coast Side Notched Cluster	Quartz	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.436	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Coastal contracting stem cluster.	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.443	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Coastal contracting stem cluster.	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.445	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Coastal contracting stem cluster. Small, rounded base.	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.448	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Coastal contracting stem cluster. Small, rounded base.	CCS	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.449	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Coastal contracting stem cluster. Small, rounded base.	Jasper	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.450	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Coastal contracting stem cluster. Small, rounded base.	Quartz	Arrowheads	NA

2.P.451	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Coastal contracting stem cluster. Small, rounded base.	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.451A	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Coastal contracting stem cluster. Small, rounded base.	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.452	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Coastal contracting stem cluster. Small, rounded base.	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.453	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Coastal contracting stem cluster. Small, rounded base.	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.468	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Small, serrated projectile point.	Obsidian	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.478	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Elko Cluster	Obsidian	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.481	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Western Triangular Cluster; serrated.	Jasper	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.491	Crescent	Stone	LA County	Several notches around crescent.	Chert	Crescent Scrapers	NA
2.P.492	Crescent	Stone	LA County	Large, worked to a point on both ends of the crescent		Crescent Scrapers	NA
2.P.493	Crescent	Stone	LA County	Thick bodied crescent with short tapered ends.		Crescent Scrapers	NA
2.P.494	Crescent	Stone	LA County	Small crescent with a flattened base.	Chert	Crescent Scrapers	NA
2.P.495	Crescent	Stone	LA County	Several notches around crescent.	Chert	Crescent Scrapers	NA

2.P.496	Crescent	Stone	LA County	Several notches around crescent.	Chert	Crescent Scrapers	NA
2.P.507	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Coastal contracting stem cluster. Rounded base.	Probably not the correct object since it does not match inventory	Crescent Scrapers	NA
2.P.507A	Crescent	Stone	LA County	Small, flat base, rounded edge.	Chert	Crescent Scrapers	NA
2.P.513	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Thick base, rounded	Chert	Knives	NA
2.P.520	Bifacially flaked stone tool	Stone	LA County	bifacially flaked to one rounded edge and a point	Chert	Knives	NA
2.P.521	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	bifacially flaked		Knives	NA
2.P.523	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	small, thick.	Chert	Knives	NA
2.P.524	Bifacially flaked stone tool	Stone	LA County	Bifacially flaked stone tool. Obviously been retouched.		Knives	NA
2.P.579	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Coastal contracting stem cluster.	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.580	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Coastal contracting stem cluster.	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.581	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Coastal contracting stem cluster.	Jasper	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.591	Projectile Point	Stone	LA County	Coastal contracting stem cluster.	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.640	Effigy	Stone	LA County	Possible effigy. Small.		Porpoise	Surface
2.P.641	Effigy	Stone	LA County	Possible effigy. Small.		Porpoise	Surface

2.P.645	Pelican Stone	Stone	LA County	small carved steatite. Possible effigy or bird stone		Hook-shaped Implement	Grave
2.P.652	Cogstone	Stone	LA County	flat on top and bottom	Sandstone	discodial stone	Shell Mound
2.P.653	Ground stone object	stone	LA County	Possible charm. Small, Oval.	granite	Hammer	Shell Mound
2.P.659	Ground stone object	Stone	LA County	rounded on one side, flattened by smoothing on the other.	granite	Hemisphere of Stone	Shell Mound
2.P.656	bi-facially pecked stone tool	Stone	LA County	Round stone with pecked divet on both sides.	Sandstone	Hammer	Surface
2.P.671	Bowl	Stone	LA County	Small stone bowl	Soapstone	Cup	Shell Mound
2.P.672	Bowl	Stone	LA County	Small stone bowl	Steatite	Cooking pot	Grave
2.P.689	Stone Tool	Stone	LA County	Possible fragment of arrow straightener	Soapstone	do.	Shell Mound
2.P.698	Stone Tool	Stone	LA County	smoothed to a point on one end.		File	Surface
2.P.699	Stone Tool	Stone	LA County	Broken in half, smoothed to a point on one end and rounded base. Smoothed to relatively flat surfaces on two sides lengthwise.		File	Surface
2.P.684	Comal	Stone	LA County	Large, one perforation.		Griddle	Shell Mound
2.P.691	Stone implement	Stone	LA County	Smoothed stone with a blunt point on one end	Soapstone	Drill	Grave

2.P.692	Stone implement	Stone	LA County	Smoothed stone tool with blunt point on each end.		Drill	Grave
2.P.693	Stone implement	Stone	LA County	Smoothed stone tool, with a blunt end on one side		File	Grave
Ventura							
2.P.362	Beads	Shell	Ventura	5 shell beads glued to a board	Thick beads with one perforation in center	Beads	Grave
2.P.365	Ornament	Shell	Ventura	One small shell shaped to a circle. Smoothed and polished. One large perforation in center.	Probably used as a bead or as a decorative item	Discs	Grave
2.P.366	Beads	Shell	Ventura	Very small beads		Card illus. small beads	Grave
2.P.583	Projectile Point	Stone	Ventura	Channel Islands Barb		Arrowheads	NA
2.P.584	Projectile Point	Stone	Ventura	Channel Islands Barb		Arrowheads	NA
2.P.585	Projectile Point	Stone	Ventura	Humboldt Cluster	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.589	Projectile Point	Stone	Ventura	Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster	Obsidian	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.590	Projectile Point	Stone	Ventura	Coastal Contracting Stem Cluster	Obsidian	Arrowheads	NA
Santa Cruz Island							
2.P.32	Whistle	Bone	Santa Cruz Island	Bone musical instrument. Filled with asphaltum.		Whistle	Grave

2.P.58	bone tool	Bone	Santa Cruz Island	Small bone object with hook on one end and hole drilled into other end.		Hook Buckle	Grave
2.P.74	bone object	Bone	Santa Cruz Island	Vertebra smoothed into a cone shaped vessel		Paint pot	Grave
2.P.76	Bone Implement	Bone	Santa Cruz Island	Bone implement, hollowed with a handle and a flattened tip on proximal end		Implement Like Dagger	Shell Mound
2.P.104	Bead	Stone	Santa Cruz Island	Large steatite stone bead		Bead	Grave
2.P.109	Ornament	Stone	Santa Cruz Island	Large steatite ornament. One hole drilled through one end. Possible pendant		Pendant	Grave
2.P.321	Ornaments	Shell	Santa Cruz Island	Two small shell rings with holes drilled on either side of one. Probably ornamental.		Rings	Grave
2.P.325	Pendant	Shell	Santa Cruz Island	Delicate shell pendant. Small with one hole drilled on one side.		Pendant	Grave
2.P.345	Beads	Shell	Santa Cruz Island	10 long shell beads. Some with designs incised onto the sides		Beads	Grave

2.P.386	Necklace	Glass	Santa Cruz Island	necklace of blue, green, red and white beads (mostly blue). One glass bead in a separate bag	Historical	Necklace	Grave
2.P.466	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Cruz Island	Coastal Contracting Cluster	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.467	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Cruz Island	Coastal Contracting Cluster	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.469	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Cruz Island	Coastal Contracting Cluster	Obsidian	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.479	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Cruz Island	Coastal Contracting Cluster	Chert	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.482	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Cruz Island	Coastal Contracting Cluster	Fused Shale	Arrowheads	NA
2.P.485	Crescent	Stone	Santa Cruz Island	Broken in half, evidence of attempted repair		Arrowheads	NA
2.P.502	Stone tool	Stone	Santa Cruz Island	Worked to a blunt end on both ends	Chert	Crescent Scrapers	NA
2.P.504	Projectile Point	Stone	Santa Cruz Island	Coastal Contracting Cluster	Fused Shale	Crescent Scrapers	NA
2.P.504A	Crescent	Stone	Santa Cruz Island		Chert	Crescent Scrapers	NA
2.P.505	Crescent	Stone	Santa Cruz Island		Chert	Crescent Scrapers	NA
2.P.506	Stone tools	Stone	Santa Cruz Island	2 objects with the same number. One is a projectile point and the other is a crescent.		Crescent Scrapers	NA
No Information							

2.P.?	Tube	Bone	NA	long bone tube worked to a point on one end	Accession number is wrong and cannot find matching number	NA	NA
2.P.?	Beads	Glass	NA	small glass beads. Mostly blue and green.	No number	NA	NA
2.P.?	Beads	Glass	NA	3 small blue glass beads	No number	NA	NA
2.P.?	Bead	Shell	NA	Small shell bead fragment	No number	NA	NA